

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

EVERY one interested in the life and work of the Christian Church feels how critical is the situation in our day. Multitudes are so apathetic about everything spiritual that they seem to be quite beyond the appeal of the gospel. One hopeful feature of the situation, however, is that preachers are being driven back on first principles. There is much anxious inquiry as to what the Christian message essentially is. In this connexion we draw attention to a book on *Modern Evangelism*, by the Rev. William MACDONALD, M.A., one of Edinburgh's most popular young preachers (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net).

Since his college days Mr. MACDONALD'S mind and heart have undergone a very vital change. For this he acknowledges the influence of Karl Barth and Wilfred Monod. 'It was Dr. Barth who showed me how I could accept the results of modern criticism and yet retain my faith in the Bible as the Word of God, and it was Dr. Monod who kindled—or to be more truthful, who rekindled—the evangelical fire in my heart.' He has now written a book on *Evangelism*, which a few years ago he would not have thought it possible that he should ever write.

Such confessions are not uncommon in these days, and they show the direction in which the winds of the Spirit are blowing. In this case Mr. MACDONALD writes with all the fervour of a new-found faith, while at the same time he maintains balance and sound judgment in his thinking.

In a concluding chapter he deals with an important, but frequently neglected, subject, namely, the connexion between evangelism and social reform. It is a subject which social reformers in particular should seriously study and ponder.

The thesis is that modern philanthropy and social reform in England grew out of Wesley's revival. The testimony of Green the historian is quoted as to the moral and social degradation prevailing in England in the years immediately preceding that revival. Not only was religion laughed at in the higher circles, but in the same circles drunkenness and foul talk were counted no disgrace, while chastity and fidelity to the marriage vow were sneered at as out of fashion. While such examples were set in high quarters, the morals and manners of the mass of the people were coarse and brutal beyond words. The recent introduction of gin had given a new impetus to drunkenness. The London gin-shops openly invited the passers-by to 'get drunk for a penny, or dead drunk for two-pence.'

Then came Wesley and his revival, which moved the heart of the English people to its depths. And from that revival there followed results of prime importance in the line of social reform. To quote Green: 'In the nation at large appeared a new moral enthusiasm. . . . A yet nobler result of the religious revival was the steady attempt, which has never ceased from that day to this, to remedy the guilt, the ignorance, the physical suffering,



the social degradation of the profligate and the poor. It was not till the Wesleyan impulse had done its work that this philanthropic impulse began.' The fervour of evangelical religion found its outlet in a passionate impulse of human sympathy with the wronged and afflicted which, as the historian says, 'raised hospitals, endowed charities, built churches, sent missionaries to the heathen, supported Burke in his plea for the Hindoo, and Clarkson and Wilberforce in their crusade against the iniquity of the slave-trade.'

---

One might add indefinitely to the historian's list. It was the impulse derived from evangelical religion which upheld Shaftesbury in his lifelong crusade against the horrible conditions prevalent in the mines and factories of his day. Similarly one might speak of Dr. Guthrie with his ragged schools, of Dr. Barnardo, of Müller of Bristol, and of Quarrier with their orphan homes. Or one might take the notable case of General Booth, a son of the Wesleyan Church, who, setting out with the single aim of saving men's souls, was impelled to fight against every form of social evil and to work by every means for the social uplift of the people.

---

We are led, accordingly, to two conclusions which indicate the vital connexion there is between evangelical religion and social reform. On the one hand, the gospel when rightly understood and applied leads on to social reform. That universal love which is the second great commandment of the Christian law implies a serious effort to promote all that concerns man's welfare. We seek to win a response in men's hearts to the love of God as declared in Christ, but we presently find that many, by reason of adverse social conditions, find it hard to believe in that message of love. So we are constrained to fight for the removal of these hindrances. We are taught in the gospel that man has an eternal worth inasmuch as he is born to be a son of God, and so we cannot easily stand by and suffer his worth to be cheapened and his manhood to be degraded. It is all this teaching about man as the object of God's love and the heir of an eternal destiny, in a word, gospel teaching, which

has sunk into the minds of our people and awakened a new sensitiveness to social evils. This is a sentiment of peculiarly Christian origin. Where the teaching of Christ is not known it is conspicuously absent. The untutored African is quite callous to the sufferings of any one who is not a fellow-tribesman; the Hindu never stirred a finger for the uplift of the millions of the outcastes of his own race and faith till the teaching and spirit of Christ had begun to leaven Indian thought. And among ourselves when it comes to purely unselfish work, work that is not likely to bring any return to oneself or one's own class, work that involves trouble and risk and self-sacrifice like the deed of the Good Samaritan, then the convinced Christian is the man to depend on. He has the spirit for it and the staying power, because his Christian faith has laid it on his conscience.

---

The second conclusion is that social reform leads back to the gospel. Let a man be interested merely in social reform. He strives to improve the conditions under which the people live, because he sees how deeply their environment affects their character and welfare. But he cannot go far before discovering that character influences environment as powerfully as environment influences character. He is interested in housing, but he soon finds that something more than the building of houses goes to the making of happy homes. He would fight the drink evil, or social impurity, or the like, but soon he finds that legislation, however good, provides no adequate cure. In short, he begins to see that the world needs moral reform as sorely as social reform. No matter how fine the machine is it cannot run sweetly without skilled men to work it, and so no social system, call it by whatever name you will, can function well without good men to constitute and guide it. It is pressed upon us that what we need, in the words of Lord Bryce, is 'a world of new and better men.' Or, as it has been put, 'the soul of all reform is the reformation of the soul.' In putting new hearts and right spirits into men the gospel has been rendering the highest social service, and the work of the evangelical preacher ought to be recognized and acknowledged, both inside the



Church and beyond it, as of the highest social value.

---

In a booklet entitled *The Sacrament of Sacrifice* (Longmans; 2s. net), the Right Rev. R. G. PARSONS, D.D., Bishop of Southwark, deals with some controversial questions concerning the Holy Communion which are exercising the minds of English Churchmen at the present time. His purpose is, however, not controversial. Rather he seeks to draw out agreements which underlie what are commonly regarded as opposing ideas.

---

Take the question of our Lord's presence in connexion with the Sacrament. It is not that He is present only in the celebration of the Eucharist; He is present at every service of His Church. It is not that He is present as the result of the Consecration; He is present from the beginning of every celebration of the Eucharist. But He does something at the Eucharist which He does not do at other services. He invests the natural elements of bread and wine with sacramental significance and effect, thus importing to those among whom He already is the very essence of His Being, His own Life, sacrificed for them and risen and ever living for them.

---

How precisely the divine Gift is associated with the earthly elements of bread and wine Christian philosophy may never be able to define. There has been great controversy concerning the theories of Transubstantiation (Roman Church), Consubstantiation (Lutheran Church), Virtualism (Waterland), and Receptionism (Calvin). What is sometimes overlooked is the fact that each of these theories affirms in its own way the objective reality of the divine Gift. But in so far as each of these theories goes beyond this affirmation, it becomes liable to criticism, and the sacrament of unity in the Body of Christ becomes a cause of dissension and division.

---

Or take the question of Transubstantiation, a doctrine rejected by the Church of England for reasons that were historically good. Yet the

doctrine in its origin was intended not to inculcate, but to combat a gross and materialistic belief as to the manner of the presence of our Lord's Body and Blood in the Sacrament. As set forth by St. Thomas Aquinas, it does not assert that the bread and wine are transformed into His Body and Blood, but that the substance of the bread and wine is transformed into the substance of the Body and Blood.

---

'To the untutored mind the term substance, unfortunately, suggests the idea of something concrete, solid, and tangible. To the philosopher, on the other hand, it stands for something abstract, ethereal, intangible. For mediæval thinkers substance denoted the underlying reality by virtue of which an entity is what it is, its inner essence as distinguished from its "accidents," which are qualities not essential to its being. It could be conceived as something separable in fact as well as in thought from any accidents which might be associated with it. So it could be argued that the whole visible, tangible, physical nature of bread and wine might remain unaltered while yet their substance had been changed.'

---

With this in mind the doctrine of Transubstantiation can be presented as a truly spiritual doctrine. It is the Divine Person of our Lord Himself that is the substance or underlying reality of our Lord's Body and Blood, and by virtue of His consecrating power the bread and wine exist no more as merely physical entities, but become His Sacrament, with His Person as their true underlying reality. And if the distinctive reality of an entity consists of its meaning, purpose, and efficacy, in a word, its 'values,' then 'transvaluation' may be regarded as an equivalent to 'transubstantiation.' Roman and non-Roman thinkers may find here indicated a way which will at least lead to a better understanding between them.

---

Or take the question of Reservation. The Reservation of the Consecrated Elements for the purpose of giving Holy Communion to the sick or others does not of itself imply any particular explanation of the Sacrament. All it implies is



a belief that by their consecration the Elements have been rendered sacramental. What they become, that they remain for the purposes of Communion. The practice of Reservation existed long before Transubstantiation was defined, and has continued in churches which have never accepted that doctrine.

---

What is forbidden by Anglican authority is that the consecrated Elements should become the focus of acts and services of adoration directed to our Blessed Lord. Such 'extra-liturgical cultus,' as the practice of the Eastern as distinguished from the Roman Church shows, is by no means the inevitable logical outcome of belief in the Real Presence. Christ is everywhere and always present and accessible to His faithful people in the plenitude of His indivisible Being. And everywhere and always He is to be adored. The presence of the Consecrated Elements does not bring Him nearer or make Him more fully present. The gift of Himself, His own life, which the Elements are, is never identified with His Personality, however closely it is associated with it. It is a precarious step in logic to proceed from 'this is my Body' to 'this is I.'

---

A remarkable essay has been contributed by Professor Emil BRUNNER, the well-known exponent of the 'Dialectic' theology, to a volume entitled *The Church through Half a Century* (Scribner's; 12s. 6d. net). The book contains 'Essays in honour of William Adams Brown,' written by a number of his pupils and friends, and designed to trace the development of religious thought during the last fifty years. There are eighteen writers and eighteen subjects, ranging from 'The Liberal Movement in Theology,' through 'Science and Theology,' 'The Interpretation of the Bible,' to 'The Church and Society' and 'Ecumenical Christianity.' It is a fascinating book, but nothing in it compares in interest and value with BRUNNER'S essay on 'Continental European Theology.'

---

Professor BRUNNER is almost as familiar to us by name as Barth. His great book, 'The Mediator,'

is perhaps even better known than any of Barth's works. He does not in this essay acknowledge any debt to Barth, but his general standpoint is the same. What he does here is to describe the nature and sources of a revolution that has taken place in continental theology within the short space of twenty years. It is the displacement of the theological outlook of the nineteenth century by what may be most intelligibly described as the Barthian position. In the nineteenth century the general standpoint was a Liberalism which regarded religion as the possession of every man. There was only one truth, seen in many forms, but really one. There was only one religion, seen in many historic faiths, but only one, and that is native to the human soul which is at its deepest depth one with the Divine Spirit.

---

This idea, that the fundamental nature of religion is always the same, though one religion is the purest form of religious essence, ruled all the theology of the last century. But (here is the amazing revolution) there is scarcely a trace of it left within the sphere of continental theological science. The writings of Rudolph Otto, for example, the only really significant representative of the theological tradition of last century, stand out to-day only as do those great pieces of rock in our woods which are regarded as witnesses of the ice age. And the new epoch is so recent that 'we who are engaged in theological work have all, so far as our own training is concerned, come out of that ice age.' How has so complete a reversal of position within so short a time been possible?

---

The revolution has not been the work of one man, or even of one theological school, such as the so-called Dialectic Theology, but is the outcome of several factors.

---

The first is that achievement of the critical historical work on the New Testament in which the liberal conception of Christianity in the nineteenth century dug its own grave; namely, the discovery of the New Testament eschatology by Albert Schweitzer. This completely disposed of the liberal portrait of Christ. Schweitzer went so



far as to say that this was a falsification of history. With the Jesus who really lived, and whom the Gospels picture, the Messiahship was not a secondary matter, but the sum total of all His activity, of His being and willing. With the picture of Christ set forth by Liberalism this Jesus has nothing in common.

The second factor in this revolution was the new discovery of Luther by Karl Holl. BRUNNER still remembers the delight with which he first read Holl. What Holl dug out of Luther's lectures on the *Romans* was as different from nineteenth-century Christianity as Schweitzer's picture of Jesus was from the Liberal one. If Christian faith is what Luther understood by it, then what Troeltsch and Otto and Ritschl understood by it is something other than Christian faith.

A third factor was the 'Conservative Theology,' which had flowed on as a separate stream alongside nineteenth-century Liberalism. This theology drew its strength out of the Revival Movement. Tholuck and Beck, Hoffmann and Franck are the genuine children of the great revival which set in at the end of the Napoleonic wars. They sought to carry on the orthodox Reformed tradition. This had seemed almost to die out at the turn of the twentieth century. But when the revolution came it was seen how valuable a treasure it had preserved, which could now be handed on to a generation ready to receive it.

The real impulse, however, came from the fourth—'Dialectic Theology.' The origin of this Movement, BRUNNER says, is to be found in three men, the two Blumhardts and Hermann Kutter. The former were the source and instrument of a spiritual quickening which was deeply influential. They had experienced the power of the Spirit of the Living God, and, though they were not theologians, they could make theologians think. Kutter taught the dialectikers to reckon with the Living God as a reality, and to let this reality be the starting-point for thinking. 'And if one wishes to understand what the Dialectic Theology seeks, then one must start here. He made no other

presupposition than that God is God, and that therefore Paul is right.'

The fifth factor, without which one cannot understand either the speed or the completeness of the theological transformation that has taken place on the Continent is found in the historical events themselves. With 1914 an historical epoch came to an end, and with it a theological one—the epoch of the optimistic belief in progress that was an outcome of the enlightenment. The world catastrophe which began in the year 1914, and which to-day perhaps has not reached its height, shattered that faith upon which the whole modern world, and especially modern philosophy and theology, rested—faith in the divinity of the human spirit.

This has been indeed the real faith of the modern man, faith in himself. The whole modern philosophy from Descartes on has been a series of variations on this one theme, the divine truth in man. The fearfulness of the historical events has given the death-blow to this faith. The problems of evil and of death, so diligently avoided by modern thought, now press upon us with their full weight. And so the rationalistic thinking of the past is for ever impossible. This new comprehension of human reality, this knowledge of evil, is as characteristic a starting-point for the new kind of theological thinking as is the reality of God.

These are the five most important factors which we can make responsible for the almost unparalleled, rapid, and radical breakdown in theology. They all point in the same direction—the eschatology in the New Testament, the faith of Luther, the experience of the Blumhardts, the Dialectic Theology, and the shattering of the modern, rationalistic, optimistic humanism—all point to a chasm in human experience, where man with all his knowledge is placed in question, yea, is brought under accusation and is judged. All truth which man gains by reason, by culture, and even by religion does not alter the fact that when man looks upon his own countenance he must be appalled at what he sees. With all his truths man cannot avoid the penetrating and permeating accusation



that he is outside the truth and against the truth. That is the point of departure for the theology of revelation.

The Bishop of Bradford, Dr. A. W. F. BLUNT, has enlarged a paper on 'Christ in the Gospels,' read at the Bournemouth Church Congress in 1935, into a little book entitled *The Gospels and the Critic* (Milford; 2s. 6d. net). In this work, intended for those who are not specialist students of the Bible, a useful critical review is given of what has been done in the last fifty years in the field of what the Germans have called 'Jesus-research.'

Let us give an account of the timely chapter on 'The New Adventure in Criticism,' namely, Form-Criticism. Here the attempt is made to go behind the written sources, having regard not so much to the question of the Jesus-of-history as to the formation of the Jesus-tradition. The further question is naturally raised of the relation of the tradition to history, but it is a question which does not necessarily arise from the pure application of the method of Form-Criticism.

In Form-Criticism a study is made of the formative period of oral tradition in the hope that the 'forms' in which the evangelic stories had been told in that period may be discerned. The chief suggestion is that both the selection of the stories and the shape which they took were influenced or determined by the necessities, hopes, and beliefs of the Early Church (which was expecting the end to come soon).

The classification of the stories is, broadly speaking, as follows: (1) Short narratives ending in a striking saying of Jesus (Paradigms, as these are called by Dibelius; Apophthegms, by Bultmann). (2) Narratives in which a miraculous act of Jesus finds its setting (Tales, as these are called by Dibelius; Miracle Stories, by Bultmann). (3) Sayings of Jesus, such as wisdom-words, prophetic and apocalyptic words, and parables. (4) Stories about Jesus, called Myths or Legends, which are narratives explanatory of a rite, or descriptive of the actions of a divine Being. Examples are the stories of the Baptism, the Transfiguration, and the Resurrection, and the Birth stories in Matthew and Luke.

Now there is nothing here to disconcert any but a literalist faith. It has long been recognized among scholars that in the New Testament, as

Hoskyns and Davey put it, events are set in a theological context and their record serves a theological purpose. But to hold that the Church selected among the stories is one thing; it is another thing to hold, as some of the Form-critics do, that the Church invented the stories. On this latter position Dr. BLUNT would make the following comments.

That the early tradition existed in fragmentary form is not true without qualification; even in Mark there is a real 'spinal column' in the narrative which makes against the supposition that the evangelist had to deal with a wholly disjointed tradition. Again, though it is probably quite true that in the Early Church there was no interest in the merely historical or biographical, yet it is difficult to believe that there was no personal interest as to the life of the Master, such as would have exercised some determinative influence over the formation of the tradition concerning Him. Yet again, although the theological setting and purpose in the Gospels are undeniable, they seem to have had less effect upon the shape of the stories than one might have expected. For example, the miracle stories in the Gospels are not used to prove Jesus' Messiahship.

Despite the tendency of Form-Criticism to offer a large field for subjective impressionism and to over-emphasize internal as against external evidence, it gives this much of solid help to those who would establish the authority of the gospel record, that it throws back into the twenty years immediately following Pentecost the rise of the stories which describe the estimate of Jesus held by His contemporaries. Thus the evidence for the truth of the Gospels is not made to rest on the authority of this or that evangelist but is linked to the living voice of the Christian communities in the earliest formative period.

'Rome, Antioch, Ephesus, Syria—one could hardly find a more important quartet of centres from which to gather the body of Christian tradition. From each comes a particular interpretation of Jesus. . . . Each Gospel . . . gives an aspect of the one Jesus; and we can best make the picture of Christ, not by abstracting from the Gospels the greatest common measure of agreed portraiture that we can justify, but by putting together the four classical aspects in order to make up the one comprehensive Figure. This, in fact, is what Christian devotion has done.'



# The Best Books on the Old Testament.

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL H. WHEELER ROBINSON, M.A., D.D., OXFORD.

EXCEPT in a highly specialized subject, with a limited literature of its own, it is impossible to draw up a short list of the best books which shall be 'best' for every one. This is particularly true of the O.T., which covers so large a field, possesses so extensive a literature, and interests so many people at different stages of knowledge and capacity. All that can be done is to define as sharply as possible the purpose of a particular selection and to offer it as one man's choice of the books best serving that purpose, without prejudice to the score or more of possible lists serving other purposes. Here I have limited myself to books in English, whilst occasionally naming foreign books; I have tried to make the list representative of the main lines of Old Testament study; I have assumed some degree of technical training, but have placed the books in a suggested order of study. On the other hand, the list deliberately excludes commentaries, dictionaries, and aids to the linguistic study of Hebrew and Aramaic, and no premium has been set on those items of publishers' lists which happen to be most recent.

The first step in the adequate study of any book or portion of a book in the O.T. is to read it rapidly as a whole in a good **translation**. For this purpose the R.V. is much better than the A.V., especially if the marginal readings are noticed, since these (as one of the most distinguished of the Revisers used to remark) usually contain the scholarship of the Revision. But the student needs something to bring him closer to the Hebrew text in the light of modern scholarship, and for this purpose *The Old Testament: An American Translation* (University of Chicago Press; 2nd ed., 1935) may be recommended (not to be confused with the American Revised Version). The emendations of the Hebrew text are not excessive; the language is modern without being out of good taste; the poetical parts of the prophetic books are set out (so far as possible) in rhythmical form to remind us that they are poetry and not prose. The translation was made by four scholars—A. R. Gordon, T. J. Meek, Leroy Waterman, and J. M. Powis Smith, who acted as editor. (It can be obtained in this country through the Cambridge University Press.) If more literary versions of Isaiah, Jeremiah, the

Psalms, and the Wisdom Books are desired, those of J. E. McFadyen are probably the best.

W. Robertson Smith's *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* was first published more than half a century ago (A. & C. Black; 1881), yet it remains one of the best books to convince a serious student of the necessity for the **critical analysis of the O.T.**, and to help him to see the general results of that analysis. No doubt there would be differences of detail and of emphasis if the book were rewritten to-day. But the solidity of treatment and the sobriety of judgment together with the good selection of crucial points for discussion, which have made the book a classic, still retain their value in our somewhat changed atmosphere and orientation. The patience of the argument, so necessary then, is still needed, if students of the O.T. are to form their own decisions and not simply to reproduce the statement of this or that critic without verifying its grounds. A large amount of general information bearing on the O.T. is here given in non-technical form. On the whole this remains the best book of 'introduction' (in the general sense) to 'Introduction' in the special sense of the full technical discussion of literary character, authorship, integrity, and date.

The exclusion of works of reference from this article might justify the omission of detailed 'Introduction' in the more technical sense, for it is probably a mistake to read straight through any such large-scale book. The dissection of documents and the analysis of subject-matter and the close comparison of vocabularies underlying this study are apt to make it rather forbidding. The best way of overcoming this is not to use a general book of 'Introduction' (of the larger and detailed kind) until some knowledge of, and interest in, a particular book has been acquired, and then to read only the relevant portion. For such purposes the most recent competent book in English is *An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament*, by W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson (S.P.C.K.; 1934). It is somewhat unequal in treatment, and less interesting than even this subject can be made; but the student confined to English books will find here much information not otherwise available to him, concerning work done since Driver's classical book. A better book (for those who can read



German) is O. Eissfeldt's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Mohr, Tübingen; 1934). Those who want an attractive book for straightforward reading will find it in Hempel's *Althebräische Literatur* (Wildpark-Potsdam, 1930-34), which is a more general work dealing with sections of the subject-matter rather than with particular books of the O.T.

For the study of subject-matter, geography logically comes first. **Geography** makes history, and it is essential that the student of Israel's history should have the general features of Palestine constantly before his mind's eye. The English student is fortunate in having Sir George Adam Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, of which the first edition appeared in 1894 (Hodder & Stoughton). It is one of those rare books which amply fulfils its own promise, i.e. to give a vision of the land as a whole, and to help the reader to hear through it 'the sound of running history.' I do not know any book which better brings out the dynamic of the history in relation to its geographical conditions; it should be read straight through from beginning to end. Doubtless the enthusiasm of the writer may have led him sometimes to exaggeration of statement or over-readiness to identify a disputable site. But these are negligible faults in the great service rendered by the book as a whole. No one who works through this book will ever think the Bible dull or will be without some sense of historical perspective. This perspective is the more serviceable because it is given in relation to particular areas of the land and is not blurred by generalization.

With the geography in mind, the student may turn to the **history of Israel**. Here, again, English scholarship has provided a thoroughly serviceable treatment of the subject, namely, *The History of Israel* (Clarendon Press; 1932), the first volume (to 586 B.C.) by T. H. Robinson, and the second (to A.D. 70), by W. O. E. Oesterley. It is more advanced in its critical position than the corresponding German work—Rudolf Kittel's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (vols. i. and ii. 1923; iii. 1. 1927; iii. ii. 1929). The latter extends only to the end of the Persian period; it is more detailed in its information, and more balanced (if too conservative) in its judgments. The value of the English work is enhanced by the summaries prefixed to each chapter, which enable the reader to get a bird's-eye view of the argument before attacking it in detail. The first volume is written more attractively than the second, which suffers by the excessive incorporation of sources in the text and by an over-emphasis on the political background.

There are many points in both volumes on which other scholars would reach a different conclusion, as is illustrated by the excellent book *Israel*, by A. Lods (Eng. tr. by S. H. Hooke). But as a whole the work can be heartily commended as the best English book on the subject, as well as the largest in scale. It is likely to remain the standard work for the next decade.

It is impossible to study the history of Israel without being introduced to the **religion of Israel**, for that religion was the inspiration and dominant factor in the history, as for no other people. The general knowledge of the religion already gained from the history will enable the student to profit by such a special study as J. Skinner's *Prophecy and Religion* (Cambridge University Press; 1922). This is generally admitted to be one of the best books on the O.T. published in recent years. It combines fine critical scholarship with a deep sense of piety towards those elements of religion which command reverence in any period. Jeremiah is the O.T. prophet of whom we know most, and he holds a place in the O.T. comparable with that of Paul in the N.T.; there is therefore much to be said for beginning the detailed study of Israel's religion (which means primarily Israel's prophecy) with this particular example of it. True, the composition of the present Book of Jeremiah and its lack of chronological order present difficulties, but these will be overcome by Skinner's aid, whilst his very able translations of the prophet's lyrical poems will throw a new light on their meaning. The value of working through such a book is not only intrinsic; it sets a high standard for both the historical and religious study of the other prophets, where the data are so much fewer and conclusions more difficult to reach.

In regard to the study of **O.T. religion in general**, there is no outstanding book in English, either of the historical development ('history of religion') or especially of the chief topics of the religion ('theology of the O.T.'). This lacuna is remarkable in view of the number of writers, and lamentable in view of the importance of the subject. Whatever the qualities of smaller books, including my own, *The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament* (Duckworth; 1913), which I am forbidden by competent colleagues to omit altogether, they cannot meet our need for an English work which would be a modernized form of the now antiquated H. Schultz, *Old Testament Theology*; Eng. tr. by J. A. Paterson (T. & T. Clark; 1892). In default of any adequate English book, the student must look to the Continent, which provides Eichrodt's *Theologie des*



*Alien Testaments* (Leipzig; vol. i. 1933; vol. ii. 1935; vol. iii. not yet published). Apart from execrable typography this is a very good book, thoroughly up to date, and none the worse (in such a subject) for being somewhat conservative. For the English student who cannot use Eichrodt there is probably still no safer guide than the very long article of nearly 120 pages contributed by E. Kautzsch to Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. v., which should, however, be supplemented by A. Lods's *Israel* (Eng. tr. by S. H. Hooke, 1932; Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.); it is to be hoped that a translation of the second volume, *Les Prophètes d'Israël* (1935) may soon appear. In these two volumes, Professor Lods gives us the best survey of the development of the religion, as distinct from its theology.

From these more general and comprehensive discussions we may pass to particular studies of topics specially important. Here Johs. Pedersen's *Israel: Its Life and Culture* (Danish text, 1920; Eng. tr. Oxford University Press, 1926) certainly deserves a place. It is an unusual book, specially concerned with the psychological approach to a number of topics, such as the group idea, the conceptions of life and personality, of human welfare and social ideals, of sin and its penalties and of death. The book is rather loosely written and would be improved by a more systematic handling of its varied themes and of the whole presentation. But it gives valuable insight into the inner life of the Israelite such as can be gained from no other book. From it the student can learn something of that most necessary lesson about all realms of ancient thought, namely, that their categories were usually different from those of our own time. To a much greater extent than we realize we are apt to force our own categories (for example, modern individualism) on material which will yield its secret only when we adopt the ancient standpoint (for example, corporate personality).

Another volume of special studies of first-class importance is G. Buchanan Gray's *Sacrifice in the Old Testament: Its Theory and Practice* (Clarendon Press; 1925). This is a posthumous volume, containing several series of lectures given in the University of Oxford; it suffers, as posthumous volumes usually do, from the absence of that final revision and co-ordination which the author would certainly have given to it. (There are also annoying errors of transcription and citation.) Nevertheless, this is an important book for the advanced student, who is prepared for that slow, cautious, and thorough method of study which characterized the author.

The volume discusses the meaning of sacrifice (emphasis falling on the 'gift' theory in contrast with W. Robertson Smith's emphasis on the communion meal, in *The Religion of the Semites*), the history of the altar and priesthood, and various points relating to the festivals. It should be noted that one of the studies, 'Passover and Unleavened Bread: the Laws of J, E, and D,' which was not discovered when the book was collected from Buchanan Gray's papers, has now been published in *The Journal of Theological Studies* for July 1936 (vol. xxxvii., No. 147).

Some readers will be surprised at the inclusion of such a book as Doughty's *Arabia Deserta* (Jonathan Cape; first published by the Cambridge University Press in 1888) in a list of O.T. books. Yet such readers will hardly be those who have read through these two difficult and lengthy volumes. I know no work which brings the reader closer to the real life of Israel, especially in its earlier phases. We live again in that nomadic world out of which came the invaders of Canaan. We see character and incident as outlined in the O.T. made vivid before us in fuller detail, through Doughty's patient and sympathetic eyes. We learn in unforgettable fashion many of those Semitic traits of thought and action which have made the O.T. the book it is. The style in which Doughty writes is purposely strange; yet when we have learnt to be patient with it, we feel that there was no other way in which the writer could have made us so feel the very texture of the life of Semitic nomads. This is not, of course, a book for everybody, and some will halt by the way, before they reach the end. Yet it is to be hoped that they will resume their long journey, for this is one of the great books of our English literature, as well as being an incomparable aid to the true understanding of the O.T.

So soon as a student of the O.T. has gone beyond the text-book stage and is able to refer to sources for himself, he will need access to those giving the **Babylonian and Assyrian background** to much of the O.T. This is best supplied to the English student by *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, translated and edited by R. W. Rogers (Oxford University Press, first published in 1912). Here are gathered the Babylonian myths which underlie the Biblical stories of Creation and the Flood, examples of hymns and prayers, etc., historical inscriptions, selections from the Tell-el-Amarna tablets, and the all-important Law Code of Hammurabi, with enough narrative or introduction in each instance to make the texts intelligible. It is



essential that some such book be at hand when the O.T. is studied, so that we may get a stereoscopic view of the O.T. statements. It contains a selected number of plates, but those who want a larger book must turn to *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testament* (Gressmann, Ranke & Ebeling, 1926-27).

In 1925, the Society for Old Testament Study published a collection of essays dealing with **different aspects of O.T. scholarship** under the title of *The People and the Book*, edited by A. S. Peake (Oxford University Press). This has proved a very serviceable volume, both for showing the wide range of modern Biblical studies and for giving up-to-date information about their progress in the various lines of research into language, literary criticism, history, religion, ritual, anthropology, archæology, and the historical influence of the O.T. The information there given now needs to be supplemented by the inclusion of work done in the subsequent decade, and there is room for a new volume on the same general lines. But the book is still to be reckoned amongst the most useful for the general student, whom it supplies with information nowhere else to be obtained in so convenient and compact a form.

Another systematic symposium is *The Legacy of Israel*, edited by E. R. Bevan and C. Singer (Clarendon Press; 1927). The inclusion of this book in our list might be challenged, since most of it does not bear directly on the O.T.; the answer would be that the true nature of any contribution to the life and thought of men is seen partly through its influence in the subsequent centuries. Thus the New Testament exhibits one great line of development from the life and religion of Israel, and Judaism another. Both are legitimate developments, in the sense that they can appeal to certain principles and practices of the O.T. as their foundation. Christianity emphasized the prophetic and apocalyptic; Judaism the nationalistic and legalistic. The book under notice characterizes the Hebrew genius, illustrates the modifications in Hellenistic Judaism (one of the best sketches we have of this) and in Christianity, and then follows out the successive periods in which the Hebrew factor has influenced the world, down to its modern literature. A great deal of interesting information, nowhere else so accessible, is contained in this book, and the numerous illustrations add considerably to its value. It deserves to be better known amongst students of the Old Testament.

In recent years the most remarkable advances

in the interpretation of the O.T. have come from the realm of **archæology**. Here the literature is enormous and constantly increasing. The best book to introduce the English reader to this field is *The Archæology of Palestine and the Bible*, by W. F. Albright (Fleming H. Revell & Co.; 1933). The first of its three divisions gives a general account of recent excavations in Palestine in order to illustrate the methods of archæology; the second gives a detailed account of the excavation of a selected city (Tell Beit Mirsim in the Shephelah), under the author's personal direction; the third attempts some correlation of archæology and the literary criticism of the O.T., as to which the author accepts the methods, whilst holding a conservative position in regard to the interpretation of the data. This attitude is a welcome change from that of some archæologists who issue their *obiter dicta* about literary criticism in a way they would be the first to resent if it were applied to their own special studies. All students of the O.T. must be deeply grateful to the work of the archæologists; but their contribution is but one among many others, and is itself not less affected by the differences of individual judgment and speculation. Those who want a more systematic and advanced account of the archæology may find it in Carl Watzinger's *Denkmäler Palästinas* (Leipzig, vol. i. 1933; vol. ii. 1935).

Altogether, the English student of the O.T. is to be congratulated on the excellent aids afforded to him, especially as compared with those available a generation or two back. In one realm only, and that the most important of all, there is unfortunately no competent English book on a large scale; this realm, as we have seen, is that of O.T. theology. Such a book would be concerned with the history of the religion only so far as was necessary to bring out its true nature and permanent values. It would show the religion of Israel as the matrix of both Judaism and Christianity, but would distinguish it from both. It would penetrate beneath the naturally propagandist exegesis of the O.T. in the N.T., and those beliefs of the contemporary Judaism which have helped to shape the present form of the O.T. itself, such as the priority and extent of the Law given on Sinai. The enlightened Christian student would not need to fear the results of such an impartial study of the theology of the O.T., for it would surely reveal a spiritual continuity which is the true modern form of the old and now discredited 'argument from prophecy.'



## The Tenth Commandment.

By HERBERT G. WOOD, SELLY OAK, BIRMINGHAM.

WHEN Saul of Tarsus tried for honours in the Law Tripes, he seems to have come to grief over the tenth commandment. For he chooses this commandment to illustrate the tendency of the law to create the sense of sin. 'I had not known coveting, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.' He may well have found the last prohibition in the Decalogue the most searching. Murder, adultery, theft, and bearing false witness—he could pass all these tests. If the Law had been stated in the form in which Jesus presented it to the rich young man, if 'Defraud not' had replaced 'Thou shalt not covet,' he might have scraped through. But like the Sermon on the Mount itself, the tenth commandment probes into motives and feelings. It is not concerned merely with overt acts; it unseals those springs of envy from which breaches of the other commandments proceed. Just here the young candidate broke down. Faced with this challenge, he could not honestly say, This commandment I have kept from my youth up.

His difficulties centred on the verb itself, not on the catalogue of objects of desire which loom so large in the letter of the original law. The old command had been drawn up for simpler and, one might say, coarser natures than that of Saul of Tarsus. 'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's.' The Law so formulated belongs to a primitive androcentric society, where a wife is a form of property, not quite so valuable as one's house, though dearer than servants or beasts of burden. While the social order here suggested has long since passed away in the West, the particular possessions specified may still be objects of envy to many moderns, and if the pupil of Gamaliel cared for none of these things, the details of the commandment may still trip some of us up to-day. The denizens of the Drones' Club may find themselves coveting Bertie Wooster's manservant, Jeeves, and among bourgeois Christians, lacking domestic help, it easily and frequently happens that one covets one's neighbour's maidservant! And alas! houses and wives may even now become objects of envious and corrupt desire. Such tangible objects may not have tempted an ardent Pharisee. Saul probably dis-

covered the meaning of 'Thou shalt not covet' in another context. The learning or the wisdom of Gamaliel may have aroused his envy, and the serenity of dying Stephen stung him into the realization that his desire of a righteousness of his own was tainted with sin at its source.

To-day covetousness is stimulated more often by general than by particular objects. We envy our neighbour's wealth or position or power, his advantages or influence or esteem. We would like to surpass him in this way or that, we do not desire to appropriate his actual possessions. Covetousness so defined exercises a far-reaching and devastating influence. It pervades and poisons our social and industrial life, and it works like a sinister leaven in movements for social justice. Mr. Demant argues that the movement from status to contract in human relations has favoured the growth of this vice. When each man had his recognized place in society, with its proper privileges and responsibilities attached, social differences and inequalities had more apparent justification and evoked less envy. When social relations are based on contract, they favour an atomic and aggressive individualism. 'If we examine our own secret thoughts about others, do they not amount to the question: "What have they done for what they have?" And if we feel that they have not paid a high enough price, we will see that they do. If the community does not pay us enough in wealth or esteem or affection or respect, we will take it out of somebody, whether it be our husband or wife, our subordinates or superiors, our rivals or friends, or the cat. The wave of violence that is sweeping over the world is a symptom of the disease which inflicts injury upon men by regarding them merely as objects of a contractual relationship, an attitude which they repay with interest and, when frustrated, with violence' (*Christian Polity*, 36). While it is idle to pretend that a return from contract to status would render the tenth commandment superfluous, a society, knit together with a strong community sense, and securing due respect for every form of work, and so assuring the status of every member, would undoubtedly be freer from the disease of covetousness than is our existing social order.

As things are, it is to be feared that jealousy and



envy contribute not a little to the feverish acquisitiveness and competitive rivalry of the modern world. The desire to get more or to be more than one's neighbour prompts a larger part of our activities than we care to admit. Veblen's *Theory of the Leisure Class*, with its analysis of the motives of social display in luxurious expenditure, may seem somewhat extravagant, but nevertheless it contains a real revelation of by-forms of covetousness. Rather perilously, the social ethic of Puritanism has ceased to insist on contentment with food and raiment, and stressed the virtues of thrift and self-help. The resultant private enterprise has achieved much. But the desire to get on, which may be praiseworthy in itself, has easily merged into the desire to outshine one's neighbour and degenerated into a readiness to get on at the expense of one's neighbours. As Professor F. H. Knight, of the University of Chicago, observes in his penetrating discussion of the ethics of Competition: 'The modern idea of enjoyment as well as of achievement has come to consist chiefly in keeping up with or getting ahead of other people, in a rivalry for things about whose significance, beyond furnishing objectives for the competition itself, little question is asked. It is surely one function of ethical discussion to keep the world reminded that this is not the only possible conception of value, and to point out its contrast with the religious ideals to which the Western world has continued to render lip-service—a contrast resulting in fundamental dualism in our thought and culture.' Whether or no emulation in all its forms and under all conditions be evil—and I should suppose myself that in some forms it is innocent and desirable—it does nevertheless easily become the vice of covetousness. The sickness of an acquisitive society means neglect of the tenth commandment.

Nor can we claim that movements for social reform and revolution are free from the same taint. We cannot, indeed, honestly endorse the judgment of Norman Douglas that Socialism boils down to jealousy. Socialism is a protest against economic exploitation which actually exists in many forms. Social unrest springs primarily from the growing sense that in the blind pursuit of material wealth we have sacrificed ends for means. A deep dissatisfaction with an industrial system in which labour is treated under contract as a mere means of production is rooted not in our vices but in what is best in human nature. Nevertheless it is difficult to exclude less reputable motives from social reform movements. When for a time at least it looked as if the industrial system was not going to extend

and deepen absolute economic misery, the Marxist discovered an adequate motive and justification for social revolution in comparative misery. The man who had a four-roomed cottage would not be content therewith if his neighbour were living in a palatial mansion. The cottage might be quite decent, but envy of those who are better off than oneself would lead to a demand for change, and for violent change.

Karl Marx states the issue in the following terms: 'A house may be large or small, but as long as the surrounding houses are equally small, it satisfies all social requirements of a dwelling-place. But let a palace arise by the side of this small house, and it shrinks from a house to a hut. The smallness of the house now indicates that its occupant is permitted to have either very few claims or none at all; and however high it may shoot up with the progress of civilization, if the neighbouring palace shoots up also in the same or greater proportion, the occupant of the comparatively small house will always find himself more uncomfortable, more discontented, confined within his four walls. . . .

'Although the comforts of the labourer have risen, the social satisfaction which they give has fallen in comparison with these augmented comforts of the capitalist, which are unattainable for the labourer, and in comparison with the scale of the general development society has reached. Our wants and their satisfaction have their origin in society: we therefore measure them in relation to society, and not in relation to the objects which satisfy them. Since their nature is social, it is therefore relative' (*Wage, Labour, and Capital*, Kerr ed., 35, 36).

In discussing a Marxist theory, one is never quite sure whether Marx claims to be simply describing or actually approving a given moral situation. If the paragraph is intended to be descriptive, I doubt whether it is fair to the British workers or to the workers generally. There is less envy and covetousness among the workers than one might expect. Unless I am much mistaken, in this country at least the workers are much more concerned for security and for a worth-while job than they are for economic equality. If, then, it is claimed that Marx is analysing the actual attitude of the workers, the paragraph suggests his bourgeois aloofness, which is reflected again and again in the theorizings of left-wing intellectuals. But if the paragraph means that Marx accepted jealousy or covetousness as a psychological factor on which to rely and build, then he cannot be acquitted of political immoralism. Be that as it may, in so far as the outcry against



the privileges or advantages of others is rooted in jealousy, it is evil.

For the same reason, the slogan of equality is doubtful. Existing inequalities are so glaring and indefensible that the demand for equality seems the natural focus for our endeavours after social justice. Yet it is quite certain that the strict economic equality which Mr. Bernard Shaw discovered to be the only true meaning of socialism would not be the realization either of a strict economic justice which rewarded men according to their contributions to wealth and welfare, or of the broader social justice which would seek to divide the community's wealth in accordance with men's needs. It is by no means clear that strict equality in the distribution of wealth is the best attainable compromise between these two forms of economic and social justice; and it is pretty clear that all levelling movements, which are usually levelling-down movements, are likely to be cloaks for covetousness. This moral disease attacks us all. It is most apparent perhaps in the tenacity with which we cling to systems of unsocial profit-making which provide opportunities to individuals to get rich quick; and it also plays some part in the make-up of the rebel and the revolutionary.

In the sphere of international relations we are confronted with the same interweaving of good and evil. In the development of imperialism we have combined the quite defensible desire to secure the satisfaction of legitimate needs with the pressure of motives that might be grouped under the head of covetousness. There is, unfortunately, too much truth in St. Augustine's description of great empires as great systems of brigandage. Yet the politics of the nations which we describe as 'Have-nots,' are not inspired simply by a sense of injustice, and their demands do not keep within the limits which a concern for justice would impose. A real factor in determining the attitudes of such nations is envy of the good luck or success of other peoples, and whenever a race or nation or social group of any kind surrenders to inordinate self-pity and blind hatred of others, it is safe to diagnose covetousness as a real cause of such a morbid condition. What Gilbert Murray wrote of Satanism and the World Order at the close of the War is still unhappily in large measure true. 'The spirit that I have called Satanism, the spirit of unmixed hatred towards the existing World Order, the spirit which rejoices in any widespread disaster which is also a disaster to the world's rulers, is perhaps more rife to-day than it has been for over a thousand years. It is felt to some extent against

all ordered Governments, but chiefly against all imperial Governments; and it is directed more widely and intensely against Great Britain than against any other Power. I think we may add that, while everywhere dangerous, it is capable of more profound world-wreckage by its action against us than by any other form that it is now taking.' Once again we see violence and hatred springing from repudiation of the tenth commandment.

Normally and naturally we associate the sin of covetousness with the lust after material wealth and great possessions. But, as we have already suggested may have been the case with Saul of Tarsus, the sin may be manifested in other, higher realms. The spheres of art and religion lie open to the inroads of the same invader. Comparisons may be odious, but it is difficult to avoid making them. The truly great sport playfully with the temptation. Was it Dr. Alexander Whyte or Dr. Joseph Parker who professed to be the subject of professional jealousy, and who said that when he thought of one of his distinguished contemporary preachers, he would lie awake at night and bite the blankets? The real saint or artist will be marked by generosity and unself-concern. Yet many men of genuine gifts succumb to vanity and jealousy, and covetousness rather than ambition may be the last infirmity of noble minds.

It is always a hard problem to determine how far we ought to accept ourselves and our limitations, and it is never easy to discover when discontent is truly divine. It might be better to be spurred on by envy than to remain undisturbed in self-complacency. Yet over and over again the man with one talent hides his talent in a napkin, because he is disheartened or discontented by comparison with his better-equipped neighbour. He is not prepared to accept himself as he is and make the most of the gifts entrusted to him. More people than we often realize are unnerved and reduced to ineffectiveness by what is at bottom a feeling of jealousy or envy. They covet their neighbour's gifts and neglect their own. This is particularly disastrous in the sphere of religious life and experience. We suffer constantly from the tendency to standardize and stereotype religious experience. Canon Raven has written somewhere of the mistaken effort of the churches to turn Englishmen who might make first-class practical Christians into third-rate mystics. Perhaps we suffer more from standardizers, from those who cannot believe in the genuineness or adequacy of any religious experience which does not conform



to some accepted pattern, than we do from a feverish desire to be in the fashion or to outstrip our contemporaries in the ways of our traditional faiths. Yet even here, covetousness and a mistaken emulation play their part. The once-born and the twice-born may not only misunderstand and undervalue one another, they may also over-estimate and envy one another. Our neighbour's gifts seem to us more valuable, his experience deeper and richer, than our own. How much of the weakness of the religious life of the churches is due to our trying to be something other than we were meant to be, and pretending to be something other than we are! The warning, 'Take heed and beware of covetousness,' may be addressed not only to our pagan anxiety about things to eat and drink, but also to our natural tendency to envy our neighbour's gifts and experience.

In writing to the Colossians, St. Paul identifies covetousness with idolatry. If it is not the only or the worst form of idolatry, it is probably the most widespread. At long last, all idolaters are egotists, and covetousness is just self-aggrandizement. Yet the Buddhist suppression of desire is not the true solution of the problem. Even emulation and ambition may be sublimated, as when St. Paul advises his friends in Thessalonica, 'to be ambitious to be quiet.' There may certainly be irony as well as wisdom in such a paradoxical goal of ambition. And St. Paul does not hesitate to encourage the Corinthians to be zealous to secure the best gifts. But he reminds them of the more excellent way, for the best gift of all is available for all, and the least gifted Christian may claim his share in the supreme grace of love which cuts at the root of every form of covetousness.

---

## Literature.

### *A NEW COMMENTARY ON THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.*

PROFESSOR E. F. SCOTT, D.D., of Union Theological Seminary, New York, has made a valuable contribution to the Moffatt New Testament Commentary in his recent work on *The Pastoral Epistles* (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net). The Introduction is written with the clarity and directness we have come to associate with his work, and the notes on the text, as translated by Dr. Moffatt, are marked by learning and great exegetical insight. Like most modern New Testament scholars, Professor Scott believes that the three Epistles were written at the beginning of the second century by a fervent admirer of Paul who was anxious to maintain the Pauline tradition in the Church of his day. For this purpose the writer made use of certain authentic Pauline notes, discernible mainly in 2 Timothy, which he used as a basis for his own compositions. Professor Scott brings forward no new arguments in favour of this view, but effectively presents those which have proved convincing to the minds of many investigators. He argues that it is impossible to bring the Pastoral Epistles within the outline of Paul's life as it is recorded by the Acts, while the theory of a release from the imprisonment mentioned in Ac 28<sup>30f.</sup> is improbable

in itself and wanting in adequate historical support. The theological position of the writer is not Paul's. 'At almost every point,' writes Professor Scott, 'he has misunderstood Paul's teaching.' 'He does not know what Paul meant by the Law (cf. 1 Ti 1<sup>8-10</sup>); he confuses Pauline faith with loyalty to a Church tradition; he forgets the central value which Paul attached to the Cross; he has nothing to say of the conflict between flesh and Spirit; his thought is quite untouched by the Pauline mysticism.' The language also of the Epistles is not Paul's, and the ecclesiastical conditions which are taken for granted are those of a later period. At the same time Professor Scott points out that it is a mistake to suppose that the Epistles were meant to be a manual of Church order. 'All the counsels are quite general in their nature, and have far more to do with personal character than with any technical qualifications.' The heresy against which the writer contends was most probably akin to that denounced in Colossians, in which Jewish and heathen elements were likewise mingled. In this connexion, in the Notes, Professor Scott explains the references to 'interminable genealogies' in 1 Ti 1<sup>4</sup> as fictitious histories, based on Scripture names, which took on a philosophical character as in the Gnostic myths.

From the historical point of view, the Epistles



are, in the opinion of Professor Scott, of the highest importance, since they reveal the Catholic Church in process of formation, and indicate an impression of Paul as he appeared in retrospect. Their permanent value is shown in the influence they have exercised in the history of the Church and in the light they give amid the practical problems of Church life to-day. 'It is surprising how many difficulties which arise in the Church life of to-day have been anticipated by this writer, and how often his directions are still helpful.' Altogether this is a stimulating and challenging commentary, which fully maintains the excellence of the series as a whole and places the modern reader in a position to appreciate and to do justice to these somewhat neglected Epistles.

---

### THE CANAANITE BACKGROUND.

People who set out to write books about the Bible in the light of  $\alpha$ , frequently leave their readers with the impression that they have studied  $\alpha$  more carefully than the Bible. We get this kind of feeling from Professor Elmer A. Leslie's *Old Testament Religion in the Light of its Canaanite Background* (Abingdon Press; \$2.00). He has rightly grasped the fact that there can be no real understanding of the religion or of the history of Israel until these are seen and interpreted as the resultant of two conflicting forces, those of the life and faith of the nomad Aramæans who claimed Yahweh as their God, and the agricultural and civic communities who preceded the Israelites in Palestine. In the introduction to this book, Dr. Leslie sets forth with admirable clearness a brief scheme of the whole Israelite story-preparation, 'Clash and Transition,' 'Yahweh or Baal,' 'The Prophetic Clarification,' and 'The Final Synthesis,' carrying his survey down to the end of the Exile. This is not, of course, the end of the development of Judaism as it appeared at the beginning of the Christian era, but it may fairly be claimed that the restored community had either eliminated the old Canaanite elements or had so purified them as to make them fit for inclusion in the system of a pure ethical monotheism. The author's sketch of the Canaanite background is a fine summary of the results reached by archæologists; one of Dr. Leslie's great gifts is his power of orderly and clear statement. His discussion of the Religion of the Fathers is based mainly on the work of two great German scholars, von Baudissin and Alt, and would have been more effective if he had allowed himself some freedom in criticising their theories. Throughout

the rest of the work, too, the author very modestly refrains from propounding original views, being for the most part content to cite German authority (with occasional reference to American scholars) in support of his position. The least satisfactory part of the book lies in the interpretation of the prophets and their age, for Dr. Leslie fails to give serious consideration to the important work done on this aspect of Old Testament studies since the War. It is strange, for instance, to find a book dealing with the religion of pre-exilic Israel which does not even mention the work of Dr. A. C. Welch, whose contribution to the subject, and especially to that side of it which Dr. Leslie is investigating, is recognized as being of the highest value, even by those who cannot accept all his conclusions. Nevertheless, the author has carried through his main intention with thoroughness and care. We are constantly recalled to the persistence with which the old Ba'alism made itself felt in the Israelite cultus and belief, and, even if our interpretation of the prophets (and of other parts of the Old Testament also) has passed beyond the stage which Dr. Leslie has reached, we can still appreciate and use the repeated suggestion of Canaanite survival, applying it with even greater effect in view of our fuller knowledge.

---

### PROFESSOR MACMURRAY ON RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE.

Professor MacMurray is concerned about the future of religion. It stands at the crossroads. The parties of social progress are, in general, passively or actively anti-religious. One reason is that they identify themselves with science, and science is empirical and looks forward, while our religious habit of mind, defending a tradition, pulls us backwards to the past and fastens us to forms of life which the march of development is surely destroying. Religion must become empirical, abandon its traditional dogmatism and lead the progressive movement with science as its technical adviser.

To assist in this decision Professor MacMurray has published three lectures under the general title *The Structure of Religious Experience* (Faber & Faber; 3s. 6d. net). His general thesis is that religion is the most inclusive of all forms of human reflection and action. Science and art are both one-sided. Science is concerned with the use of things, art with their enjoyment. The one is practical, the other contemplative. Religion includes and transcends both. It is, as much as



science and art, concerned with the real world, only its world is that of persons and their mutual relationships. Its aim is to raise this world of relationships to perfection in fellowship. The religious man in the only true sense is the man for whose life this fact has been recognized as the fact of primary significance in all life and in whom it has become not merely a fact but an *intention*.

This is a brief summary of a book whose close-knit thinking is happily and usefully relieved by a good deal of repetition. It will not appear from the summary to have much to say about what is generally regarded as 'religious experience.' But the writer does not altogether neglect the divine side, though he does not make very much of it, unless we at every point ourselves interpret mutuality of relationships as including the Other. But he does point out the inevitability of this inclusion in a fine passage (pp. 79-81). Reflection, he says, carries the self beyond the limits of the actually given. As a result it involves the universalizing of the actual experience which is the object of reflection. Reflection reveals the universal in the particular. If the object of reflection is the relation of the self to another self, the universal which is so revealed must be universal personality. The idea of God on the universal Other is, therefore, inherent in the act of religious reflection. The existence of God cannot be rationally denied, because He is the primary correlate of human rationality. He is the infinite person in whom our finite human relationships have their ground and their being.

To read this book is a bracing experience. But when it is read and pondered over, one is left wondering whether this is the kind of religion that will lead the van of progress. Is there a deep enough motive in it, enough real religion to stir men up to this admirable mutuality? Will men ever be *reasoned* into enthusiasm and consecration and love?

### THE PAPACY.

Two new books on the Papacy deserve attention. The first is *The Men of the Vatican*, by Mr. Thomas B. Howells (Independent Press; 3s 6d. net). It extends to no more than a hundred and sixty-four pages; it is not therefore a history of the Papacy; it is what the sub-title calls it, 'A Short Account of the Rise and Fall of the Power of the Popes.' It is well written and the facts are accurately stated. The book is frankly polemical, but we wish that more Protestant polemic had exhibited the temper of Mr. Howells. His view is that the facts speak

best for themselves. His conclusion is—'the Roman Church will win—in the last resort—all it is worthy of winning. But it will not do this by the conquest of Protestantism—for that movement is also of the Spirit. Indeed, in their essence, each alike, at its best, both represents and satisfies a profound need of human personality. But if Rome's shallower, external claims provoke history, then history must reply. And if it calls upon philosophy for its helpful aid to avert the meaning of facts, we have the New Testament to our hand. To this court the claims of Pope and Canon Law alike must come up for judgment. It is the affirmation of Protestantism that Rome has erected a system magnificent as a Government, but mean indeed for the Religion.' To all interested in the controversy with Rome this book may be commended as a well-informed argument from history, all the stronger because of its restraint.

The other is *The Roman Primacy to A.D. 461*, by the Rev. B. J. Kidd, D.D. (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net). The name of the author will be to most of our readers all the assurance necessary of meticulous scholarship and true historical insight. Dr. Kidd has no propaganda in view; his aim is to ascertain and set before us the history of the See of Rome till the middle of the fifth century. Every statement is documented. In our opinion Dr. Kidd's history of the early Roman Primacy will at once meet recognition and keep its place as the best of the many that have appeared. This work should certainly be mastered by Protestants. It reveals the nature of the primacy which from early days was naturally and inevitably accorded the Roman See, and by what steps this veneration became the basis for arrogant claims such as the early Bishops who looked with respect to Rome would not have admitted.

### EAST AND WEST.

In *East and West: Conflict or Co-operation?* edited by Mr. Basil Mathews (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), we have a series of ten papers by writers who may all be fairly called experts in various departments of Eastern life. Their aim is to explain the present situation and mentality of the East, so that intelligent understanding and mutual sympathy may dispel the risk of conflict and pave the way to co-operation. The papers are all too short for the great topics of which they treat. Papers of outstanding interest are 'The New Life of Eastern Women,' by Ruth Woodsmall, and 'The Far-Eastern Network,' by Professor G. E. Taylor. The



former writer says: 'Though she has only recently begun to enter public life, the woman of the East often brings to this experience a certain balanced wisdom which has been matured through sacrificial service in the silence of a long waiting. Moreover, from her background of the complex family system of the East, the Eastern woman may also contribute to the understanding of the difficulties of peaceful living in a world family.' The book closes with an earnest and weighty paper on 'The Leadership for the New Day,' by Dr. John R. Mott, full of practical counsel and inspiration. It is a book to put into the hands of students and all young people who will have to face the building of the new world, either in co-operation with the awakened millions of the East, or in dread conflict with them.

---

Professor Harris Franklin Rall, D.D., has given us an uncommonly able and interesting book. Its title is *A Faith for To-day* (Abingdon Press; \$2.00), and it is 'written for men who want a faith by which to live, who wish to hold it intelligently, who want to face honestly all the facts bearing upon the matter, and then with equal honesty ask what such a faith means for life.' The discussion ranges over a wide field but the writer shows his competence at every stage. One may feel at times that his views are too clear cut, leaving too little room for the mystery of things, but on the whole his treatment is admirable and gives just the kind of straightforward guidance that the modern man needs. There is a particularly fine chapter on God and the Fact of Evil. Other topics dealt with are Science and Religion, What Sin is and does, What it means to be saved, Prayer, the Bible, the Life to Come. These and similar topics are treated very freshly in the language of to-day. There is evidence throughout of wide study and culture, and the amount and variety of illustrative quotations make the book extraordinarily readable.

---

*The Musings of a Christian Pilgrim in the Holy Land* (Epworth Press; 1s. 6d. net) is an account of a tour by a 'Lay Preacher of the Methodist Church in South Africa.' It has a large number of excellent illustrations which are worth the price of the book. For the rest, the descriptions are the work of a kindly and pious observer whose mind is full of Scripture and whose habit it was to moralize pleasantly on all he saw.

---

Dr. C. J. Prescott has served the Methodist

Church, and indeed the Church Catholic, well by his stimulating volume, *Methodist Churchmanship, Complaint and Plea* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). The aim of the book is to claim for Methodism her true place in the life of the Holy Catholic Church. 'If,' says Dr. Prescott, 'it is thrown in the teeth of the Methodist that he is merely a member of a sect not two centuries old, he can retort: "Do others belong to the Anglican Church of the Reformation? So do I. Do others claim as theirs the Church of the Middle Ages? So do I. Do others boast they belong to the Undivided Church? So do I. Do others claim their descent from the Apostolic Primitive Church? So do I. The good heritage that comes from all these comes to me also. I should not be the man I am to-day, I should not be sharing in possessions I cherish, were it not that I have my part as an heir in the bequest from a notable and glorious past."' As this quotation shows, it is in no ignoble spirit that the writer makes his claim. Indeed, he shows that he has much occasion to chide Methodists for their neglect of their Catholic tradition. He is also wide awake to the importance and necessity of Reunion on a much wider scale. This welcome book can do nothing but good for the people for whom primarily it is intended, but it will also prove salutary reading for members of other religious communions as well.

---

It was in 1924 that Dr. Moffatt's *Everyman's Life of Jesus* was issued. Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have now published a new edition. Although the price is only 2s. 6d., the book has been greatly improved in form, and with its clear type and delightful white binding—protected by a royal blue paper jacket—it would make a very appropriate present. For those who do not know it already, we might say that it consists of a prologue and then eighteen chapters giving the Life. Each chapter has an introduction by Dr. Moffatt in which the facts are summarized in a very vivid way, and the story is then continued with extracts from Dr. Moffatt's translation of the Four Gospels.

---

'*In Understanding Be Men*' (Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions; 2s. net), by the Rev. T. C. Hammond, M.A., Principal of Moore Theological College, Sydney, is a synopsis of Christian doctrine for non-theological students. It was first published in March 1936, and in October 1936 was re-issued with the addition of an index. It is designed to encourage students in Faculties other than that of Theology to examine for them-

selves the principles of the Christian faith, and is arranged to suit the methods of group study.

After affirming the Bible to be the ultimate authority in matters of religious doctrine and practice, Mr. Hammond proceeds to expound the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith in the usual 'logical' order, beginning with the Godhead and ending with the Last Things. The book is on text-book lines and is competently written. Its standpoint is, of course, Biblicist and conservative. Charles Hodge might have stood sponsor for it.

The Rev. C. H. Titterton, M.A., B.D., has written for the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions (2s. 6d. net) a little book of some hundred and twelve pages on *Five Great Non-Christian Religions*.

The studies are short—thirty-eight pages to Muhammadanism, twenty-two to Hinduism, twenty to Buddhism, sixteen to Confucianism, and fourteen to Shintoism. They do not go either far or deep; but they are lucid, and say a good deal in brief space. But always it is a Christian looking at these other religions from the outside and with somewhat hard and critical eyes. The author has small skill in thinking himself into the minds of those whose faith he is describing. But then, as Montefiore once remarked, a true account of any faith can never be written. For those inside it are, of necessity, prejudiced in its favour, while those outside it cannot know the secret of its power.

Of that last, perhaps this little volume is, in part, a further proof.

There seems to be no end to the undertaking of popularizing the history of the Early Church. There must surely be a great deal of interest in that vital period, in which of course we rejoice. The latest to attempt an interesting account of the struggles, the triumphs, and the heroes of the first five Christian centuries is the Rev. A. Bevil Browne of Likoma Island, Nyassaland, who entitles his work, *The Way and the Faith: A Study in Early Church History* (Macmillan; 6s. net). In the main it is a reliable account, although it is scarcely fair to Gnosticism, and quite scrappy as to why Christians were persecuted by the State.

It is difficult to speak too highly of Dr. C. G. Montefiore's new book—*A Short Devotional Introduction to the Hebrew Bible, for the Use of Jews and Jewesses* (Macmillan; 3s. 6d. net). Here we have a work by a great scholar whose learning is matched only by his broad-mindedness and surpassed only

by his spiritual insight. His position is that normal among the critical school, and he makes no attempt to conceal or to apologize for his opinions. They are introduced quite simply and naturally, and always seem to spring inevitably out of his religious and devotional standpoint. The author writes quite frankly as a Jew speaking to his own people, but, very fortunately, his book is available for Christians as well. There has always been a danger that scholars should divide themselves into watertight compartments, and few readers would guess from their technical work at the profound spiritual life of S. R. Driver or the evangelical and pastoral instincts of Karl Marti. Perhaps Canon Simpson's 'Pentateuchal Criticism' was the one work in which the writer's deep religious passion is made evident alongside of his reason and learning—until the appearance of Dr. Montefiore's little book. It remains only to add that the whole is presented with the inimitable charm which characterizes all that Dr. Montefiore writes, and no one, whether Jew or Christian, who is interested in the Bible, can afford to overlook the most delightful and helpful presentation of the modern position that we have yet seen.

When a writer declares that God 'wrote history in advance and called it prophecy' one may admire his self-confidence but cannot regard him as a serious interpreter of Scripture. In *The Clouds are Lifting* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 1s. net) the Rev. Oswald J. Smith, D.D., gives some studies of prophecy in general and of the visions of Daniel in particular. On these he bases a fervent appeal to the unconverted to put their trust in Christ, and to believers to prepare for His speedy coming and the beginning of the millennial reign.

*Christ Praying*, by the Rev. E. Howard Cobb, M.A. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net), is not, as one might expect, a discussion of our Lord's habits of prayer. Its subject is prayer in general, and the title has been chosen 'for the purpose of emphasising that the highest form of prayer is really Christ praying in us and through us.' There are points where it is difficult to follow the writer, as when he says: 'No prayer can be a prayer of faith with an "if" in the middle of it, and I am firmly convinced that no prayer should contain the words, "If it be Thy will."' (This on the ground that the will of God should be ascertained before the prayer is offered.) Again, he writes in regard to meditation, 'Whatever you do, be careful to avoid using your own power of thought, but wait for the



thoughts that God will give you.' At the same time it must be said that the book is on the whole eminently practical in its suggestions, and is well fitted to inspire faith in the power of prayer.

Why do writers who frankly acknowledge that they have no special equipment to enable them to speak with authority on a subject rush into print with a book on that very topic? This question is suggested afresh by *Why Be An Ape—?* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net). It contains 'Observations on Evolution by a London Journalist.' Some of the observations are quite good, but none is new. According to the author belief in evolution is dangerous, essentially materialistic, and godless. But, we ask, is it in any way necessarily so?

The University of Oxford has now a Spalding Chair of Eastern Religions and Ethics, a fascinating subject. And, with a wisdom which deserves our gratitude, the authorities have chosen as its first occupant no less than Radhakrishnan. Here comes his Inaugural Lecture—*The World's Unborn Soul* (Milford). Like all its author's work, it is a notable bit of writing. A long survey of the past, and of the unrest of the present—marked as usual by an enviable knowledge of all kinds of literature—leads on to the suggestion that the East might now, as it has had before, have something to help us in our difficulties. And with that the author plunges into an account of Hinduism. It is a leap into the deep end of the bath; and beginners, thinking of taking the class, must have come up spluttering and panting. A fine bit of work without a doubt, but not its author at his lucid best.

Dr. Bronislaw Malinowski has published the Riddell Memorial Lectures (seventh series, 1934-5) under the general title, *The Foundations of Faith and Morals* (Milford; 2s. 6d. net). The work is a contribution to social anthropology on the lines that one would expect of this first-hand student of primitive culture. He is himself unable to accept any revealed religion, Christian or not, but he is persuaded of the value of religion for human life and welfare. In every human culture religion has its specific part to play, and this is fundamentally connected with faith in Providence, in immortality, and in the moral sense of the world. It is from the Trobriand Islands that he draws the chief material for the illustration and support of his various conclusions, such as that mythology is the complement of the ordinary knowledge or science of

primitive man and not its substitute. The function of myth is not that of explanation or of allegory. Mythology is the charter of social organization and the precedent of religious ritual. In this, mythology supplies the foundations of all beliefs, especially the belief about life after death and about the miraculous powers of magic and ceremonial. Though Dr. Malinowski deals chiefly with primitive religion in its dogmatic, ritual, and ethical aspects, he has the contemporary situation also in view, and appears to be deeply concerned lest religion should surrender its own equipment of faith, ritual, and ethics to 'cross-breeds between superstition and science, between economics and credulity, between politics and national megalomania.' He would have us work for the maintenance of 'the eternal truths which have guided mankind out of barbarism to culture, and the loss of which seems to threaten us with barbarism again.'

A book on the public worship of the Church, historical in its method and appreciative in its judgments, has been written by the Rev. William D. Maxwell, B.D., Ph.D., minister of Hillhead Parish, Glasgow—*An Outline of Christian Worship* (Milford; 7s. 6d. net). It deals with Primitive Worship, Liturgical Forms in the East and in the West, gives special attention and space to Liturgical Forms in the Churches of the Reformation (for the excellent reason that these have been largely neglected by previous writers), and finishes with a section on the Christian Year. The book is an effort to trace the development of Christian worship down the ages, and in this respect it is a competent and thorough piece of work. The care with which the different Reformation rites are described is a feature of the book which is specially valuable. It is not to be expected that all service books would be mentioned, and it is therefore perhaps not surprising that only one of those produced in recent times by non-established Presbyterian churches in Scotland has been mentioned, though at least four others could be named. But if the main thread is to be followed, subsidiary liturgical efforts may perhaps be passed over. The book is worthy of all praise for its admirable account of the devotional history of the Church.

An excellent piece of work will be found in *Scottish Church Architecture*, by Mr. J. S. Coltart (Sheldon Press; 12s. 6d. net). It is not a book that will add much to the complacency of the Scot. For it affords pretty clear evidence that the Scottish people are neither great builders nor possessed of

artistic merit to any extent. At a time when Gothic art was flourishing abroad and in England, Scotland was apparently little affected by it. There are four buildings (two of them ruins) that do show traces of good Gothic influence, Glasgow and Elgin Cathedrals, Melrose Abbey and Roslin Church, but not many more. There are, however, many interesting buildings in Scotland of respectable antiquity and some beauty, and these are described with careful scholarship by Mr. Coltart. The book is profusely illustrated, and no matter what part of the country one comes from, he will find something here, both description and illustration, that will interest and instruct him.

A singularly able and satisfying book on Revelation has been produced by Mr. W. J. Ferrar, M.A.—*The Apocalypse Explained for Readers of To-day* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). It is a small book but we have no hesitation in saying that it will prove to many just the book on the Apocalypse that they have been looking for. The first chapter gives a lucid and compact account of Apocalyptic in general; the second depicts the historical background of our Apocalypse. Then follow two chapters giving the text and a brief commentary. Then we have a discussion as to date, authorship, and modern theories of the composition. Lastly, Mr. Ferrar sets forth his views as to the permanent value of the Apocalypse, and finds it in the end to be 'its portrayal of a constant attitude of faith, characteristic of the Church of Jesus Christ.' It is amazing how so much has been packed into a hundred and twenty-nine pages. It is one of the books which must not be missed.

Three books have come from the S.P.C.K. Publishing House, all soundly Scriptural, and all competently handling important subjects. *The Gospel in Experience* is an introduction to Christian doctrine, written by the Rev. S. H. Childs, M.A., Vice-Principal of a missionary college. The book is the answer to a need he himself has often felt for a simple manual for training ordinands and teachers in the main truths of Christian doctrine. He therefore goes over the whole field. His book is a 'systematic theology' in small compass. But for its purpose it will be found perfectly adequate. *The Forgiveness of Jesus Christ* is a study in the Gospels by Canon W. Emery Barnes, D.D., until lately Professor of Divinity in Cambridge University. It deals with gospel narratives of Christ's forgiving grace, the woman of many sins, the paralytic, the 'impotent' man, and other similar

incidents. The name of the distinguished Cambridge scholar is itself a warrant of adequate treatment. This book should be useful to preachers. *The Gifts of the Holy Ghost*, by the Rev. Frank Hudson Hallock, S.T.D., is a simple treatment of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It is not designed to be a Confirmation manual, but might well be used for some such purpose. Each of the chapters deals with some 'gift' of the Spirit—understanding, wisdom, counsel, godliness, strength. A book on this subject is always welcome to many of us, and the devout will find in this one real spiritual inspiration and light. Each of the three books costs 3s. 6d. net.

It is a good sign that so many books of school prayers are being compiled and published. Last month we drew attention to Mr. Hugh Martin's collection, which was not designed for any special denomination. This month another arrives—*The Oxford Book of School Worship*, Part II. (for Juniors) and Part III. (for Seniors). It is issued by the Oxford Diocesan Council of Education (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). It is frankly Anglican. But no collection of prayers can be altogether sectarian. We are all at one on our knees. And teachers of all shades of Church colour will find a great deal here to help them in the conduct of worship. The prayers are definite, not vague; comprehensive, not narrow; suited to the capacity of youth, not above their heads. This is a book to be warmly welcomed.

In view of the World Conference on Faith and Order, which is to meet next year at Edinburgh, the essay of the Bishop of Croydon, *Moving Towards Unity* (S.C.M.; 6d. net), is very timely. In it Dr. Woods supplies a valuable account of the Faith and Order Movement, and describes in eloquent and forceful words, the great milestone passed at Lausanne in 1927, the amount of present progress achieved, and finally the next stage. Would that this little pamphlet could be read by every member of the Christian churches! If that could be, the success of the Conference of 1937 would be electric.

The Rev. Llynfi Davies, M.A., B.D., Senior Tutor at the Bible College of Wales, Swansea, writes on the *Origin of the Galatian and Other Epistles* (Western Mail and Echo Ltd., Cardiff; 5s. net). He does not possess the gift of clear writing, but it appears to be the main contention of his book that only late in his career did Paul become



an apostle of the Mother Church. It is part of this contention that the Galatian visits to Jerusalem were private visits, and that the second of them is neither the Famine nor the Council visit. If these findings are correct, then the story of Paul would require to be rewritten and the origin of the Gal-

atian and other Epistles reconsidered. Mr. Davies himself seems to fear that his findings will not be favourably received in the world of New Testament Criticism. However, no critic will deny that much careful thought and study have gone to the making of this little volume.

## Form-Criticism and Christian Ethics.

BY THE REVEREND ARCHIBALD CHISHOLM, D.LITT., GLASGOW.

THE ethical teaching of Jesus is to be found, not only in the passages described as 'The Sermon on the Mount,' but in other sections scattered throughout the Gospels. If it were possible to select from these many other sections a concise and consistent group of utterances which could be regarded as embodying the vital parts of the Christian Ethic, the task of outlining the ethical teaching of Jesus would be considerably simplified. The researches of the scholars belonging to the *Formgeschichte* School are in this connexion most helpful; alongside the Sermon on the Mount, we may now place certain parts of the Gospels, which may be regarded as sermons preached by early evangelists in the towns and villages of Palestine.

The method of *Formgeschichte* (*formgeschichtliche Methode*) as employed by Dibelius and G. Bertram, R. Bultmann, K. L. Schmidt, Albertz, and others, seeks to explain the origin of the tradition about Jesus, by reconstruction and analysis, and strives to get behind the earliest Gospel and written sources. Professor Vincent Taylor, in his *Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, has done much to familiarize British readers with this school of research; the chief results of Form-Criticism are provided in *From Tradition to Gospel* and *Gospel Criticism and Christology*, by Professor Martin Dibelius, who has endeavoured to indicate the earliest form which the preaching of the Christian message took. Well known in connexion with his work for the 'Faith and Order' movement and for the Universal Council for Life and Work, he was appointed in 1915, at the age of thirty-two, to the chair of New Testament Exegesis and Criticism at Heidelberg, which had been occupied by Johannes Weiss, Adolf Deissmann, and Karl Holstein. In 1919, just after the War, working in the nursery, the only heated room in his house, he published

as a preliminary sketch *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*. He believed that he had discovered the very earliest form of Christian teaching in eighteen paradigms or missionary stories; these paradigms contain, in brief form, the sermons preached by early Christian preachers at their gatherings. The initial stage of the Christian tradition, he asserts, is to be discovered in some short separate paragraphs, or pericopæ, which were 'pearls put together to form a string' (*Gospel Criticism and Christology*, 27, 104).

A paradigm is defined as 'a short illustrative story of an event, not more descriptive than is necessary to make the point for the sake of which it is introduced.' An examination of the speeches of Peter and Paul led Dibelius to the conclusion that Jewish Christian teaching was as stereotyped as the Scottish sermon of a former generation. First there came the Kerygma (or message), then the scriptural proof, and finally the exhortation to repentance.

For purposes of illustration we may take one of the paradigms (Mk 2<sup>23ff.</sup>), dealing with the Sabbath, in which the teaching is similar to that provided in the story of the healing of the paralytic, and of the man with the dropsy. The paradigm is brief and simple; there is no information regarding place or circumstances; the disciples were walking through a certain field and began to pluck and to eat the ears of corn. As is customary there is included some text from the ancient law; in this instance the reference is to David and the shewbread. Then there is a word of Jesus, easily remembered, dealing with a vital principle. 'The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.' Frequently in the paradigms there are found declarations which may be regarded not as the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, but rather as the

comments of the preacher, and with good reason Dibelius regards the final clause 'The Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath' as a preacher's addition. Frequently, in a somewhat arbitrary manner, Dibelius delegates to the list of preacher's comments, words which we might well regard as actually from the lips of Jesus. This is little reason for questioning, as he does, the authenticity of such words as 'whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother,' and 'I came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance.' Dibelius attributes the words, 'Come unto me, all ye that labour,' to the later community because they contain the totally 'unevangelical idea of rest' (p. 280), and contain a self-recommendation of the Gospel. This is no more arbitrary than his conclusions regarding other texts.

Though the teachers of this school regard the paradigms as most important, they regard other sections of the Gospels as of real value, chiefly in portraying conditions within the Early Church. After the paradigms come the tales, which stand complete in themselves and have real preaching value, possessing a descriptiveness and detail not found in the paradigms. The tales tend, according to Dibelius, to display Jesus as the 'thaumaturge,' and to view miracles as an end in themselves. There are other stories of very real value which he describes as 'legends,' meaning by the word stories about saints to be read on saints' days. Here his selection again seems arbitrary; for example, the story of Martha and Mary might well be regarded as a paradigm in spite of the arguments raised in five places in *From Tradition to Gospel* supporting his view that it is a 'legend.'

Before the contribution of Dibelius and others can be of real value in providing us with the consistent group of sayings which we desire, the scholars of this group will require to abandon their hesitation regarding the authenticity of the key-words in each of the paradigms. At the moment they generally regard words quoted in the New Testament as from the lips of Jesus, as being merely the comments of the early Christians. If they possess no greater authority than this, they are of little value for the purpose we have in mind, though they have their own significance as indicating the point of view of the Early Church. In *Gospel Criticism and Christology*, Dibelius still refrains from any assertion regarding the authenticity of the words quoted in the paradigms. He has established a strong case for his contention (p. 71) that the tradition was shaped by men who had neither biographical intention nor

literary ambition, but he asserts (p. 74) that the evangelists had not, at their disposal, any noteworthy tradition in Aramaic, in which language the words of Jesus were originally spoken, and this he adduces as further evidence for refraining from accepting as authentic, in the form in which we have them, the words which the Gospels attribute to Jesus. This is not sufficient, and it does not seem unlikely that fuller examination will lead to the conclusion that, central in each paradigm, is some word, which fell from the lips of Jesus actually as it is quoted, and was treasured by His followers.

The list of paradigms (or, as others call them, Apophthegmata or Pronouncement Stories) cannot be considered as final. Professor R. H. Lightfoot regards the number of paradigms as smaller than that suggested by Dibelius, and Dr. Rudolf Bultmann excludes some of the cases of healing from the list, but we may take as the stratum, which we should examine, the selection given by Dibelius.

If, then, on the basis of the researches of the advocates of this method, we are to ask what were the messages, based on words of Jesus, which the earliest preachers declared, the subjects treated fall into the following divisions:—

#### (1) *Religion and Legalism:*

Under this heading fall the words of Jesus regarding the Sabbath, as given in the sections of which the following are the salient words:

'Can the children of the bridechamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them?' (Mk 2<sup>18ff.</sup>).

'The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath' (Mk 2<sup>23ff.</sup>).

'Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill?' (Mk 3<sup>1ff.</sup>).

'Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a pit, and will not straightway pull him out on the Sabbath day?' (Lk 14<sup>1ff.</sup>).

#### (2) *The Place of the Individual Conscience:*

This issue is dealt with in the passages containing the words:

'Behold my mother and my brethren' (Mk 3<sup>30ff.</sup>),

outlining the Christian's attitude to his home, and

'Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's' (Mk 12<sup>13ff.</sup>),

referring to his obligations to the State.



(3) *The Universality of the Gospel :*

The incident in which

'They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick' (Mk 2<sup>13ff.</sup>)

are the salient words was an apologia for the action of Jesus in breaking through the barrier which separated the devout Jew from the despised tax-gatherer.

'My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves' (Mk 11<sup>15ff.</sup>)

applies this principle in its wider aspects, while

'Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God' (Mk 10<sup>13ff.</sup>),

asserts the place of children within the Kingdom.

(4) *The Implications of Christian Loyalty :*

The sections containing the sayings:

'Ye have the poor with you always, and whensoever ye will ye may do them good: but me ye have not always' (Mk 14<sup>3ff.</sup>),

and

'One thing thou lackest' (Mk 10<sup>17ff.</sup>),

with their demand for a love which is prepared for complete self-surrender, are in accord with many other passages in the Gospel.

(5) *The Centrality of Faith :*

There are in this section four incidents, with which are associated the sayings:

'Son, thy sins be forgiven thee' (Mk 2<sup>1ff.</sup>).

'Hold thy peace, and come out of him' (Mk 1<sup>23ff.</sup>).

'Go thy way; thy faith hath made thee whole' (Mk 10<sup>46ff.</sup>).

'A prophet is not without honour, but in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house' (Mk 6<sup>1ff.</sup>).

Though not belonging exclusively to the sphere of ethics, they show the place of faith in the forgiveness which Christ brings, and in creating the capacity to understand the message of the Kingdom.

(6) *Humility :*

This forms the keynote of

'To sit on my right hand and on my left hand is not mine to give; but it shall be given

to them for whom it is prepared' (Mk 10<sup>35ff.</sup>),

and

'The Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them' (Lk 9<sup>51ff.</sup>).

(7) *The Life to Come :*

The questions relating to the life after death must have often formed part of the early Christian teaching and were dealt with as in the passage in which is contained the saying:

'When they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven' (Mk 12<sup>18ff.</sup>).

It is impossible to summarize briefly the contents of these passages. They deal with issues, which to-day are as vital as in the early days of our faith. The disciples discovered that they had not merely fallen under the sway of some new principles of life. However powerful such may be, principles by themselves too often fail; they tend to be like cyclones, catching for a moment our sympathy and loyalty, but under their influence we seldom are carried on in the same direction more than one day at a time. The disciples were brought under the sway not only of the principles of the Kingdom, but of a personality who won their affection, and slowly they learned the implications of being loyal to 'the Way.'

Group life had for thousands of years been built around the principle of social and familial solidarity; it had its strong points, but now the importance of the individual was emphasized. The individual stood before God, alone. Hitherto men had been saved in great measure from the necessity of individual judgments, but Christianity asserted that man was to stand, facing all the issues for himself; essentially the teaching of Jesus was an individual ethic. This new sense of the value of the individual had certain results. Man became more absorbed in questions relating to what was to happen in the life to come, and the new emphasis on the value of the individual raised also questions associated with the authority of the State, for opposition came not only from the family circle, but from the rulers. The pagan ideal was the totalitarian state. When we read the word of Jesus, 'Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's,' we are inclined to desire, with Strauss, that He had been more explicit, but the value of the statement consists

in the declaration that even in a State ordered according to pagan ideals there must be given a place to God. In the lands to which the Christians went carrying the gospel, where men were forced to burn incense to the Emperor, this was a vital issue.

The passages relating to the implication of Christian loyalty will always be of significance. Without accepting the position of Bultmann and Dibelius that these utterances are based on the accepted practice of a group (the more intense group) within the later community, we should note that the characteristic feature of the passages is the demand for intensity in Christian living. The Christian's love of God and for his neighbour is not to be expended in any measured fashion; it is intense, unbounded; it goes all the way that love dictates.

Although it may be regarded as arbitrary to select such a stratum of thought as the subject of examination, similar results regarding the central place such doctrine held would emerge from a wider survey. We do not discover any teaching for our present situation which follows from the message of Jesus as corollaries may be deduced from mathematical propositions, but we are given certain 'ordinationes' (to use Brunner's phrase) or principles of action. The individual Christian is guided in the home, in the State, in his contact with people of other races or classes, and in association with his fellow-Christians. Thus the paradigms provide a challenge to which the Church of our day must give its attention; otherwise once again we shall hear the rebuke; 'A prophet is not without honour, but in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house.'

## The Oldest Biblical Papyrus, and a Leaf from a Testimony Book.

BY THE REVEREND C. A. PHILLIPS, M.A., BOURNEMOUTH.

THIS new discovery, following up so quickly that of the second-century fragments of the Gospel of St. John, comes also from the John Rylands Library collection, and from the able editorship of Mr. C. H. Roberts of St. John's College, Oxford.<sup>1</sup> The first consists of fragments of at least four columns of a roll containing the Book of Deuteronomy, and its probable date is that of the middle of the second century B.C., and it is therefore the oldest existing MS., not only of the LXX, but of the Bible in any language.<sup>2</sup>

These fragments come from two pieces of cartonnage purchased in an envelope along with a bundle of miscellaneous papyri by Dr. Rendel Harris in 1917. He had gone out at the end of 1916 to join Dr. Glover and Dr. J. H. Moulton at their special mission in India; but his ship was torpedoed in the Mediterranean, and owing to the

consequent state of his health, he decided to remain in Egypt, and await their return there. The editor says that the purchase probably came from the Fayûm, and one particular name in a list on one of the accompanying fragments supports this. Dr. Harris himself in his memoir of that journey states that the Fayûm drew blank at his first visit, and that it was subsequently in some village that shall be nameless that the purchase was made.<sup>3</sup> When he returned home, he fortunately left the parcel with a friend in Cairo for safe keeping till the end of the War; for, as most of our older readers will remember, it was on this tragic return voyage that this ship too was sunk, and Dr. Moulton died from the exposure. When the collection reached England, it had been transferred by arrangement to the John Rylands Library.

Mummy cartonnage consists of waste papyri of all kinds, cut into sheets or strips, and three or

<sup>1</sup> *Two Biblical Papyri*, ed. by Mr. C. H. Roberts, M.A. (Manchester University Press; 2s. 6d.).

<sup>2</sup> The earliest Hebrew MS. is not earlier than the ninth century A.D.; the Nash papyrus of the second century, containing the Decalogue and the Shema, is probably liturgical.

<sup>3</sup> 'In the Fayûm villages were founded by Jews, and they lived on equal terms with the Greeks.' Swete, *Introd. to O.T. in Greek*, p. 7, with note referring to Mahaffy, *Empire of the Ptolemies*, p. 86 n., and Philo, *De sept.*, 6.



four thicknesses glued together to form a kind of *papier-mâché*. 'Then the outside was covered with a coating of plaster and decorated with paint; and various pieces of the cartonnage were placed on or round the head, breast, and legs of the mummy outside the cloth wrappings. Papyrus was only used in this way as a background for plaster in the decoration of mummies during the three centuries preceding Christ; at other periods cloth or plaster alone was employed.'<sup>1</sup> In this case, there were six strata of small scraps placed haphazard—evidence that the work was hurriedly done, and that the mummy was probably that of one of the poorer members of the society—and so liberally coated with gum that the usual methods of separating with warm water or a hot iron were unavailing. 'Such was the resistance of the gum . . . the only solvent was found to be to immerse them in water at boiling-point for some sixty seconds. This drastic procedure was successful, and luckily resulted in no material damage either to papyrus or ink.' Twisted and folded along with a fragment from the First Book of the *Iliad*, there now came to view a leaf in uncial writing, which, along with several other fragments, was recognized by Mr. Roberts as a scrap from Deuteronomy in Greek. The hand is a book hand, 'stylised and careful and of considerable elegance; its most striking feature is the use of decorative serifs particularly noticeable on  $\nu$ ,  $\upsilon$ , and  $\tau$ ; it might well have been a part of a roll for Synagogue use. The family to which this hand belongs is fairly well known, and it can be 'securely assigned to the second century B.C., and was probably written not much later, if at all, than the middle of that century.'

The other Greek fragments, besides those of *Iliad*, I. 244–250, 252 ff., are pieces of a tragedy, of some historical work, of lyric verse, and of an account, and there are also a number of Demotic fragments, all belonging to the end of the second century B.C. or the beginning of the first. Finally, the verso of the Deut. leaves, before they were thrown away for waste-paper, was used for writing some account or memorandum, in a large sprawling hand probably of the same date as the *Iliad* or other fragments. This fact by itself may be an additional support for the date reached from the palaeographical evidence; for it is not likely that a MS. of the Law would be so degraded soon after it was written. On the other hand, it might have been made for an honoured or wealthy proselyte

whose family, or at least the next generation of it, did not sympathize with him in his use or veneration of a Jewish sacred Book.<sup>2</sup>

The passages contained are: Dt 23<sup>24</sup> (26)–24<sup>3</sup> 25<sup>1-3</sup> 26<sup>12, 17-19</sup> 28<sup>31-33</sup> and some unplaced fragment, including [κα]ι χωνε[υτον],<sup>3</sup> from 27<sup>15</sup>. It is remarkable how much can be learnt from just these fifteen verses about the textual tradition of the roll; there are some eighteen to twenty variants with a remarkable affinity to Cod. Alexandrinus (A), and the result of the study of these 'makes still more difficult the view which other discoveries have done much to shake, and which, formerly associated with the name of Hort, was the basis of the Cambridge Septuagint, namely, that Cod. Vaticanus (B) "on the whole presents the version of the Septuagint in its relatively oldest form."' Unfortunately the Chester Beatty Papyrus of Deut. which occupies a place half-way in date between our MS. and the great Uncials is not extant for this part of Deut., but in the first half it has the least affinity with B, while in Numbers it has the most. Thus 'our first glimpse of the Septuagint some hundred years after the original translation was made<sup>3</sup> reveals that a text approximating to that of one of the great families was already in existence; then for three hundred years the history of the LXX text disappears, and when it again emerges into the light with the Chester Beatty papyri, it is significant that it is the A text rather than the B that is predominant in the Book of Deuteronomy.'

Of the readings, two peculiar ones may be noticed. In 23<sup>25</sup> ἐπέλθης for εἰσέλθης looks like an instance of the influence of popular usage, the former being the technical word for trespass, which, though it is a case of entering another man's property, does not, however, really apply to the circumstances. In 25<sup>2</sup> καθιεύ αὐτὸν ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, where ὁ κριτής has to be supplied, and AFM<sup>©</sup> and the versions read καθιεύς αὐτὸν ἐναντίον τῶν κριτῶν, while B reads καθιεύς αὐτὸν ἐναντίον αὐτῶν. With regard to Sacred Names, ὁ Κύριος does not unfortunately occur where the actual text is extant, but in 26<sup>17</sup> the average line of twenty-seven letters makes it probable that it was written in full like those in the Johannine fragments; but only four lines farther down there is a twenty-three letter line.

<sup>2</sup> None of the names on the verso, or in the other accounts are Jewish.

<sup>3</sup> The commonly accepted date of the LXX, or at least the Pentateuch part of it, is about 250 B.C. in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus.

<sup>1</sup> The editor here quotes Grenfell in a paper read to the Classical Association of Ireland in March 1918.

Professor Adolf Deissmann<sup>1</sup> calls attention to the fact that the best preserved of these fragments (Dt 25<sup>1-2</sup>) contains a passage of the O.T. Law, τεσσαράκοντα μαστιγώσουσιν αὐτὸν, οὐ προσθήσουσιν, which played a painful part no less than five times in the life of St. Paul (2 Co 11<sup>24</sup>, ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων πεντάκις τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν ἔλαβον). 'We may gather from this that the Septuagint was for the Diaspora not only a book of edification but was still used,' with the characteristic precaution of παρὰ μίαν to ensure the οὐ προσθήσουσιν, 'as the accepted code of legal penalties by the spiritual rulers. The "scouring" paragraph on our old leaf from Egypt must have carried very much the same authority two centuries later in the Bible rolls of the Diaspora.'

The second papyrus, a fourth-century fragment, is a part of a double leaf of a Codex containing a collection of O.T. passages, and, as is the case with other of the literary papyri in the John Rylands Library, other fragments of the same Codex have found their way into another collection. These were published by G. Rudberg under the title *Septuaginta Fragmente*, and are now known as *Pap. Osloenses*, ii. 11. The combined texts contain Is 42<sup>3</sup>, 4 66<sup>18</sup>, 19 52<sup>15</sup> 53<sup>6</sup>, 7 53<sup>11</sup>, 12, an unidentified verse, Gn 26<sup>13</sup>, 14, 2 Ch 1<sup>12</sup>, Dt 28<sup>8</sup>, 11. The Oslo fragments were described by Rudberg as a *Textbuch für kultische Zweck*, and the later editor of the Oslo papyri thought that 'Isaiah combined with Genesis suggests that the book was meant for liturgical use.' But the addition of the new fragments, Is 66<sup>18</sup>, 19, 2 Ch 1<sup>12</sup>, Dt 28<sup>8</sup>, suggests a different purpose. All the passages can be classed as 'Messianic'—prophetic of Christ or of Pentecost,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'The Oldest Bible Leaf,' in *The British Weekly*, Aug. 6, 1936.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the use of Is 66<sup>18</sup>, in Cypr., *Test.* i. 21, not ii. 21, a little slip on p. 51, as is also the statement on p. 52

and we have here a part of a Testimony Book, a collection of extracts from the O.T. to prove the witness of O.T. writers to the truth of the Christian faith. The inclusion of Gn 26<sup>13</sup>, the prosperity of Isaac, in such an anthology seems at first strange, but it is a good example of popular allegorical interpretation, and the clue lies in the opening words of v. 13 (the actual line is missing in the MS.), καὶ ὑψώθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος . . . ; that one word is enough to link up the passage with Nu 21<sup>9</sup> and Jn 3<sup>14</sup>.

It is an appropriate coincidence that these fragments which have now come to prove the first extant bit of a Testimony Book should form a part of one of Dr. Harris's finds; for his study of the *Testimonies* is the standard work on the subject.<sup>3</sup> It is not likely that they form a part of a copy of a Testimony Book such as Dr. Harris envisages—the first written book in Christian use, perhaps already used by St. Paul and the Evangelists, and later on by Cyprian and Tertullian, Gregory of Nyssa and Barsalibi. There is no trace in this collection of introductory formulas, and the passages outside Isaiah are not used by Cyprian or Gregory. But it may be rather, as Mr. Roberts suggests, a copy of what Dr. Harris had in mind when he wrote: 'It was *a priori* probable they would be little books of wide range. The parallel which suggests itself to one's mind is that of the little handbook known as the *Soldier's Pocket Bible*, which was carried by the Ironsides of Cromwell and was composed of a series of Biblical extracts, chiefly from the Old Testament, defining the duty of the Puritan soldier in various circumstances in which he found himself, and arranged under headings of questions appropriate to the situation.'<sup>4</sup> that only the quotations from Is 52, 53 are employed by Cyprian.

<sup>3</sup> *Testimonies*, by Rendel Harris and V. Burch (Cambridge University Press; Pt. i. 1916, Pt. ii. 1920).

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.* Pt. i. p. 1.

## In the Study.

### Virginibus Puerisque.

#### Road or Street?

By THE REVEREND A. E. WILLMOTT, BOW, LONDON.

'Jesus saith . . . I am the way.'—Jn 14<sup>6</sup>.

Do you live in a road or street? It does not really matter very much where your home is, because our

homes depend upon us and not where our house is situated, yet there is a great difference between a road and a street. A road is a riding: if you have read Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*, you will remember how Griffith describes Wolsey's last ride from York to Leicester: 'At last, with easy roads, he came to Leicester,' which means that he came with easy



ridings; his mule did not turn contrary on the way! You have noticed that *ride* and *road* are similar in sound, and this gives you the clue to the meaning of road. You also know that people speak of the 'Road of Life,' and the 'Road to Success,' and these phrases show that we are thinking of a journey. A road thinks of the beginning and the end: it is a way between distant places.

And what is a street? A street belongs to towns and villages; it is a paved way; it is a place where houses are built, and where people live together. How do people use the idea of street? When we speak of 'Fleet Street' we think immediately of newspapers and all that is connected with them. Very often you hear people say that they have been taken 'up a side street,' which means that they have been taken out of their way. A street has the idea of the things which remain in it, of the people who stay there; a street does not lead anywhere.

So we may put the difference between a road and a street like this: a road is a great way which thinks of a beginning and an end, a journey with a destination in view; a street is a turning off the great way where travellers are apt to stay and forget their journey and their destination.

How important is that thought for our lives! We are always told that we are travellers; that while we are growing we are also going; and that we must get somewhere. I knew a man who, whenever some one died, always said that that person had 'gone home.' Don't you think that was a lovely way of putting it? Some one had got to his destination. He had travelled the road, reached the end of his journey. We are all travellers, but, where are we? On the road or up the street? There is the road which thinks of the beginning and the end. You are beginning—what about the end? Jesus says, 'I am the road,' and He is the Great Way by whom we can reach the place where God would have us be; the place which my friend called 'Home.' But the sad thing is that so many folk, although this road is ready for all, still cluster in side streets; they have forgotten their journey in life, and have lost sight of their destination. As Isaiah says, 'They have all gone out of the way.' They are in the place which Bunyan in his *Pilgrim's Progress* called 'By-path Meadow'; it may be very attractive and very pleasant—but it is 'up a side street.' They are clustering instead of journeying.

We began by asking, 'Where do you live?' and now you can see the meaning of the question, and

catch something of its importance. Are you on the Great Road, or are you playing about in some side street which will get you nowhere? Get on the road with Jesus! Then you will be able to join in the hymn which you have sung so often:

Children of the heavenly King,  
As ye journey, sweetly sing;

and be able to sing it right through to its last verse:

Lord, obediently we go,  
Gladly leaving all below;  
Only Thou our Leader be,  
And we still will follow Thee.

### A Provoking Child.

BY THE REVEREND STUART ROBERTSON, M.A., LISBON.

'Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works.'—Heb 10<sup>24</sup>.

'How provoking!' Have you ever said that? Often. Have you ever had it said about you? Often. I know very well you have.

Some morning, for instance, you are getting ready for school. You have lain a bit too long, thinking about getting up. You have potted a bit more in dressing. Breakfast has been somewhat of a hurried business, and now you are in the final rush to be off in time. That is the moment when your shoe lace chooses to break! Most provoking! You are hurrying for a train in a London tube. As you leave the lift you hear the train. A scamper along the passageway, a breathless series of brake-neck jumps down the stairs, and as you reach the platform the train-doors close in your face and you watch the train vanish into the tunnel. Most provoking!

You are playing a hockey match. At last the chance you have been hoping for has come. Good passing has done the trick and you are through the defences, and the way to the goal is open. You reach the sacred semicircle, and just as you are ready to shoot you skid on a slippery bit of ground, down you go, and the chance of a score vanishes. Most provoking!

I can fancy that was what the foolish virgins in the Parable said when they found their lamps had no oil in them; and what the guests in another Parable said when they found the doors shut and were told they were too late for the supper; and the man who found he had no food to give to the friend who had turned up unexpectedly at midnight.

Yes ! things can be most provoking, and so can people. Has your mother never said to you, 'You are really a most provoking child' ? Perhaps she had good cause to say it.

One often reads in the papers of some man who has lost his temper and done something violent that has brought him into the police court. He can't deny the facts, but he pleads that he had received 'great provocation,' and that is taken into account.

What does 'provoke' mean ? It means 'to call out.' A provoking thing is what calls out something that is lying quiet in us, and the provoking thing is usually something unpleasant, and what is called out is also usually something unpleasant, in fact, our bad temper. So 'provoking' is an unpleasant word to our minds : it belongs to disagreeable things and disagreeable people and it never finds us at our best, for we use it when we are ruffled in our tempers.

Yet, in spite of all that, 'provoking' need not have only a bad meaning. If it means to call out, it need not only mean to call out the bad in us. There might be provoking things that call out the good in us, provoking people that waken in us good impulses that are asleep till they are provoked. It is so : for I find St. Paul writing to the Christians of Corinth that their generosity had 'provoked many' : which means, not that it had made them angry, but that it had stirred them to be generous also. Elsewhere we are told to consider one another, 'to provoke unto love, and to good works.' This is a good sort of provocation.

I have a privet hedge in the front of my house. It needs to be trimmed regularly, and at times I look at it, and although I know perfectly well that it needs trimming I persuade myself that it doesn't, and walk past it saying to myself, 'It'll do fine for a while yet.' Then when I come back I find my next door neighbour has trimmed his hedge ! It makes mine look so untidy that I have got to start in at once and trim mine. He has provoked me to this good bit of work.

Our front lawn and his run into each other without any hedge or fence between, and so when he cuts his grass I have got to cut mine. When I cut mine he has got to cut his, or it would look like a man that had shaved only one side of his face. So my neighbour and I, who are excellent friends, continually provoke each other, and it's good for us both.

Evil provokes us to evil, but good provokes us to good. Jesus Christ wakens in us the desire to be like Him, and sets us singing, 'I want to be like

Jesus.' That is how the religion of Jesus spreads. I have heard a story of a missionary who showed such great kindness to a poor Hindu boy dying of cholera that afterwards the father came and wished to become a Christian, 'because,' he said, 'I want the religion that made her do what she did for my boy.' She had provoked him to good, as she herself had first been provoked by Jesus.

Go and hear a great pianist : you come home provoked to practise harder. Go and see any one do supremely well something you do only middling well and the determination to do better is called out in you. So Jesus, who is the supreme goodness, provokes us to long for His likeness and to follow Him ; and if we do, unconsciously but inevitably, we shall provoke others to the same good way ; and to be called 'a most provoking child' in this sense is indeed a very great compliment.

## The Christian Year.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

### On Proportion of Life.

'Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith.'—Ro 12<sup>a</sup>.

The immediate application of these words is to the use of the charismata, or spiritual gifts, bestowed on the various members of the primitive Church, and to the importance of manifesting them in due measure and balance. Every man, says the Apostle (in effect), who has a religious gift of any kind must exercise it with a proper regard to its character, amount, intensity, and practical value to others.

Let us take this principle of proportion and due measure, and apply it to life in general, seeing how it works out, first, as regards the qualities that make up our ideal of character ; and, secondly, as regards the rule of practical conduct.

1. *The Christian ideal of character* includes the principle of proportion. We are to reach out, not in the direction of one virtue only, or of a few, but of all ; we are to 'grow up unto him in all things, who is the head, even Christ.'

It would be well, perhaps, to point out that this does not mean that we are to aim at uniformity in character. That was the fault of Puritanism, which in its later manifestations coerced its votaries into a solemn, rigid, sour uniformity of behaviour. And that is the fault of the pietistic type, which would cut off half the natural human qualities and



develop the rest into a kind of hothouse growth. These sectional ideals are destructive of the free life of the spirit.

We are all intended to be different in the outlines and in the content of our individuality, and yet to preserve a sense of proportion. There are many types of architecture—for instance, the Assyrian, the Egyptian, the Doric, the Gothic, the Moorish, the Indian—and there are laws of proportion that govern them all. And so we are to gain and to maintain our separate individual type of excellence in the religious life.

Nor are we to imagine that such proportion need interfere with the utmost development of our special gifts. Paul delighted in any individuality of endowment in his converts, and he encouraged them to cultivate this to its limit.

We must not, however—and here we find the completing thought in this argument—be satisfied with having mere individual excellences. If there is anything lacking in our disposition, see that our endeavour be to supply it. Are we strong in imagination, but weak in will? Are we full of zeal, but tend to grow soon discouraged? Are we warm in our sympathies, but lacking in persistence? Are we cheerful in disposition, but quick of temper?

The tendency of this age is towards specialism in every department. Life is so full and so complex that there is 'not enough for this and that'; we must concentrate, we say, on one thing, and do that well. That is good within limits, but it has another side to it. This is the reason why we have so many schools of thought. This is why we divide up so much into parties in State and Church. This is why we have so much one-sidedness of judgment on all subjects. Men tend to isolate themselves from the broad stream of human life and linger in backwaters while the great tide moves on. However inevitable this may be in some directions, let us not submit to this tyranny of specialism in religion. Let us aim at being full men and women, having sympathies that follow the daylight round the globe; having thoughts that ripen with the process of the suns; having a mind open to all God's truth whencesoever it may come; having a soul with windows open north, south, east, and west, so that we may be accessible to every wind of God's Spirit, and be stimulated by every fragrant breath of Divine influence. Let us pray that we may not become narrower, more cramped, less sensitive to all that is fair and true and good, as we grow older, for that is the general danger, but rather that we may retain the freshness of youth with the experi-

ence of years, and grow in intensity and breadth and fulness of life to the end.

2. And now let us consider the need for applying *the principle of proportion in practical conduct*. Life is not only a matter of this or that, but of one thing out of many things, of less or more, of circumstances that affect the issue and make it different, of infinite shades and degrees and measures, and all these things have to be taken into consideration in determining most questions of conduct, good or bad.

For instance, take the question of speaking the truth. We must always do this, we say; and of course that is right. But in practical life truth and falsehood shade into one another. A look, a gesture, a smile, will often change a truth into a falsehood by the way it is spoken. Or—how much of the truth should a man tell his friend? It is something that affects other people as well, let us say, and if he tells him too much he may do mischief to a third party; if he tells him too little, he leaves the way open to a serious misunderstanding. Even in so clear and rigid a thing as truth-speaking there is thus room for less or more, and that in the interests of truth itself.

How much more is this so in those cases where there is no vital principle at stake, but where it all depends on adapting means to ends, on mood, temper, sentiment, relationships, and so on!

Take family government. What is the right limit of authority in training children? Take the very practical question of how Christians should spend the Lord's Day. Is there not a right principle of measure and proportion wanted?

Once more, take the question of amusements. What is the right place for this element in a Christian life? It is again a matter of less or more, of proportion. If men recognized this, no one would doubt the value of relaxation, and the brightening effect of concerts and dramatic art and pleasant games, and all that goes to lighten the burden and care of life. The reason why pleasure is dangerous is not because it is wrong, but because it is so difficult to indulge in it in due measure. The rein has to be drawn tight in order to keep most of us within due bounds.

Let us pray that God may enable us, both in character and in conduct, to keep the happy mean in all those directions where life opens out possibilities of too much or too little. The way is narrow, but it is good; it is difficult, but it leads to a great reward. We are here to grow into a full-grown or perfect man—such was Jesus our Lord.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> E. Griffith-Jones, *The Unspeakable Gift*, 173.

## SEPTUAGESIMA.

## Four Bible Stories: Men who were Angry with God.

BY THE REVEREND R. A. JONES, B.A., LUMB  
IN ROSSENDALE.

'How shall I curse, whom God hath not cursed? And how shall I denounce, whom the Lord hath not denounced?'

'Behold, I have received commandment to bless: and he hath blessed, and I cannot reverse it.'—Nu 23<sup>8, 20</sup>.

Beginning from these words, which have come down to us from very ancient times, let us try to catch a new vision of the vastness of the Kingdom of God, and realize anew how all peoples are embraced in His love and mercy.

From the great literature of the Bible let us select four passages for our meditation which will show us men in rebellion against the Christian idea of God—men who were afraid and angry at the love of God; who found it impossible to conceive that God really cares about all men regardless of their race or condition.

(1) *The Story of Balaam*.—It must be remembered that this is a very ancient story; so ancient that it is impossible to make a final judgment as to the historical accuracy of all its details. Balaam was a pagan soothsayer; he was a kind of prophet, but not a preacher prophet like the great ones of Israel: he was a diviner, a foreteller of the future; the kind of man who went into a trance, a type still to be seen in the East to-day. And he was a 'professional'—they sent for him 'with the rewards of divination,' and they believed in the effect of his blessing and cursing.

The Israelites at that time, having got out of Egypt, were pursuing their way: they had conquered a tribe called Amorites and now came into the plain of Moab. The Moabites were afraid, and sent for the professional curser! 'Balak the son of Zippor was king of Moab at that time,' and he sent for Balaam to come a great distance and to curse Israel; but when Balaam came the words would not come forth from his mouth. The writer of the story explains that Jehovah, God of Israel, said unto Balaam, 'Thou shalt not curse this people, for they are blessed.' And for all the persuasion, and the bribes of Balak, this soothsayer could not curse Israel. 'How shall I curse, whom God hath not cursed?' 'Behold I have received commandment to bless, and he hath blessed, and I cannot reverse it.' And Balak's anger was kindled against Balaam.

Was there some kind of holy influence that

possessed this pagan magician? For his ancient words speak still to those who shut up their heart and affections, and all sense of responsibility to men of other races and countries, while at the same time they profess the religion of Jesus Christ which unites the whole human family in the Fatherhood of God.

(2) *The Story of Jonah*.—The second story of a man who was angered and humiliated because he had a vision of the wide embracing, wondrous love of God for all men is that of Jonah. The Old Testament book entitled 'Jonah' is a sermon of great power and beauty. The prophet Jonah is called to go on a mission to Nineveh; he was told to speak the words given him by the Lord. The message was: This wicked city is to be overthrown—in forty days God's vengeance will be felt here—repent—proclaim a fast in case God may turn away His fierce anger. Jonah preached so powerfully that they did repent, and 'God saw that they turned from their evil way,' and God did not destroy that city. 'But it displeased Jonah exceedingly, and he was angry'—angry at God's love and mercy!

Jonah went out of the city and sulked. He wanted to see that city destroyed. It was very sultry and hot, and a great plant grew up to shelter him; then a worm ate up the plant, and Jonah prayed to God, 'Let me die.' God said, 'Are you right to be angry for this gourd?' And Jonah said, 'I do well to be angry even unto death.' And the Lord said, 'You feel sorry about the gourd, for the which thou hast not laboured, neither made it to grow—which came up in a night, and perished in a night—and should not I feel sorry about Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than six-score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left, and also much cattle?'

(3) *In the Synagogue at Nazareth*.—The third of these strange stories—and here we are among the established facts of history rather than in ancient tradition or allegorical teaching—is a story of a crowd of people in the synagogue at Nazareth. They had been listening to Jesus; they had wondered at the gracious words that came from His lips. But after they had listened a little longer, 'all in the synagogue were filled with wrath.' They rose up and put Him out of the town and would have done Him violence. What did Jesus say that caused them to be angry? What set them all at once in a passion? Only two incidents from their own Scriptures. This was one: 'The word of the Lord came to Elijah, Arise, and get thee to Zarephath



(Sarepta), which belongeth unto Sidon, and dwell there; behold I have commanded a widow woman to sustain thee.' 'There were many widows in Israel in the day of Elijah, but unto none of them was Elijah sent save unto Sarepta, unto a woman that was a widow.' The other was of Naaman, captain of the host of the king of Syria. He was a great and honourable man, a mighty man of valour; by him the Lord had given deliverance to Syria: but he was a leper. Elisha, who had the power to heal, brought about his healing. 'And many lepers were in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet, and none of them was cleansed saving Naaman the Syrian.'

What was there in these two stories to enrage the congregation at Nazareth? Only this—the woman of Sarepta in Sidon was not a Hebrew; yet the great messenger of God, Elijah, was sent to her for sustenance and not to hundreds of Jewish women. And Naaman the Syrian chief, not a Hebrew, was healed by the power of God mediated through His messenger Elisha, while there were hundreds of lepers among the Hebrews.

This is what Jesus meant: God is merciful and loving; and God cares as much for people wherever they live; whether they are clean or unclean; and He will have mercy on any who call unto Him; 'for the same God is Lord over all, and is rich toward all who call upon him.'

(4) *The Elder Brother*.—The fourth is perhaps the best known and best loved of all the stories Jesus uttered: 'Now his elder son was in the field: and as he came and drew nigh to the house, he heard music and dancing. And he called one of the servants and asked what these things meant. And he said unto him, Thy brother is come; and thy father hath killed the fatted calf, because he hath received him safe and sound. AND HE WAS ANGRY, and would not go in: therefore came his father out and entreated him.'

He was angry and would not go in; a second Jonah! He sulked because his father was so kind and merciful and good. 'I've never broken your commandments—served you all these years—this man, this prodigal has wasted his life, and you have killed the fatted calf for him.'

What are we to think about the man who is angry at the Love of God; who thinks he is pleasing God by ignoring the man who has fallen; by ignoring the man whom God yearns after more than the most holy?

Such a man doesn't know what the Love of God is. He is satisfied with what he has done—kept commandments, done as he was told; and he will

not trouble himself about any who have had a harder time, or who, through their own fault, have failed to keep the rules.

Now the faith we preach is this: there is something worse that can befall a man than to fail to keep laws: you can keep all the laws in creation, be respectable, and give one-tenth of all you possess, fast twice in the week, attend the synagogue regularly, BUT if you lose touch with God, and the Eternal Fatherhood, your last state will be worse. A people that has sinned can repent of its evil ways; a prodigal son can rise and go to his Father, but the man who *does not know God as Father of all* is angry and will not go in. 'Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not love, it profiteth me nothing.'

Why are men angry at the Love of God? 'For He is like a refiner's fire.' Is it because men know instinctively that the Love of God scorches up with a flame all our selfishness, that they fear it and shrink from it?

In the world we meet every day people who have not advanced far beyond the law of 'eye for eye, and tooth for tooth, a life for a life.' Is the Christian God, then, a myth? Is reconciliation folly? The picture Jesus drew of the judgment of nations was quite familiar to His hearers; a judge, a throne, all nations gathered, and the separation of them as of sheep and goats: but the standard of judgment of Jesus was utterly different from that of His hearers; for them it was national. His judgment was one of Love. 'I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat.' His judgment was whether a man or a nation had love or goodwill at heart.

After the war the late Principal Thomas Phillips wrote a book, *The Grace of God and a World Religion*, in which he foresaw that out of the world war might arise a world religion. He wrote: 'I cannot believe in a parochial God even if His parish be Christendom. I cannot believe in a God who is a respecter of persons, even if those persons be saints. I cannot believe in a God who makes His sun to shine in patches and His rain to fall in compartments. I cannot believe in a God who is other than impartial or who is less than universal.'

So we beseech men in this world of strife and unrest, not to shelve the problems of internationalism, but to face them in the knowledge of the redeeming Love of God. We must ask even to-day before we make rash judgments—'How shall I curse, whom God hath not cursed? And how shall I denounce, whom the Lord hath not denounced?'

For His blessing is poured out upon all; His judgment is of Love alone; His ways are higher than our ways.

SEXAGESIMA.

### Eleventh-Hour Men.

'Unto this last.'—Mt 20<sup>14</sup>.

1. 'Idle in the market-place'—do we realize what that means? The weariness that comes after a day, not of work, but of doing nothing. The sweat on the brow that means no labour done. Scorched with the heat of noon, but gaining nothing from its precious hours. Chilled with the breeze of evening, but feeling none of the refreshment it gives to the tired worker. 'Idle in the market-place!'

It was a scene the boy Jesus had doubtless often witnessed during these years at Nazareth when He was thinking these thoughts that were to regenerate the world. He had seen the labourers as with hopeful faces they gathered in at early morn. But some were left untaken. Until at length the slanting rays admonish them that the eleventh hour has struck. And then, just as they are turning sadly away, a vineyard husbandman saunters into the market-place. 'Go ye also into the vineyard,' he says to them, 'and whatsoever is right that shall ye receive.'

So far the Parable may have been fact, but it is more than likely that its end is the work of Christ's own imagination.

(1) Now, why does Jesus tell this story? Because it brings before us a character which is very far from being unknown to-day, but which it is interesting to think was not unknown to, or unnoticed by, the Carpenter of Nazareth—'*the man who has never had a chance*,' the unemployed who is so, not because he will not work, but because no man will have him; nay, who is not so for a day or a week, but for half a life and more.<sup>1</sup>

Our hearts are heavy, wrote Bishop F. Theodore Woods—or if they are not, they ought to be—with the thought of fine specimens of English manhood dragging out a workless existence, body and soul, just kept together by the dole, womenfolk wretched as day after day the man comes back with the same old dreary tale, worst of all, young lives, youths who might develop into useful citizens, deprived of that healthy occupation by which their characters could thrive and grow.

(2) Another type of the eleventh-hour labourer

may be found, not in the workless man, but in *the man who is compelled to do uncongenial work* because of the lack of means to perfect his education. In a sense this man is busy enough, but it is not his true work. It does not call forth the powers that are in him. All that is best in his mind is unemployed.

Dr. L. P. Jacks begins his *The Faith of a Worker* with this story. 'In a certain factory where food products are prepared and exported to all parts of the world there may be seen an instance of that monotonous labour which is so marked and terrible a feature of mass production under modern industrial methods. It consists in knocking the top off an egg. The eggs are delivered by machinery on to a table behind which stands a row of women knocking off the tops. One woman has done it for thirty years.'

Gray, in his *Elegy*, goes over the churchyard musing on the unknown and obscure lives that are represented by these 'heaving turfs.' Perhaps, he suggests, here rests 'some mute inglorious Milton.' Perhaps yonder lies 'some village Hampden guiltless of his country's blood.' But, alas! 'chill penury froze the genial current of their soul.' As Oliver Wendell Holmes sings:

A few can touch the magic string,

And noisy Fame is proud to win them—

Alas for those that never sing,

But die with all their music in them!

Nay, grieve not for the dead alone

Whose song has told their hearts' sad story,—

Weep for the voiceless, who have known

The cross without the crown of glory!

(3) Another type of the eleventh-hour man is *the man who is disqualified by physical infirmity* from taking his part in the battle of life. Sometimes this disability reaches back to the very dawn of life. We think of the crippled, rickety children who are so often the product of city life, the mentally deficient, the maimed, the halt, and the blind. There must have been multitudes of these in Christ's time. We know how His heart went out to them, and how He strove to ameliorate their sad condition. But as He did so He sighed, sighed to think of how many He could not heal, who must stand all the day idle, unemployed because unemployable.

2. And what has Jesus to say about him?

(1) Well, in the first place, it is good to know that Christ thinks about him. Jesus is no 'rose-water optimist' who does not face the facts of life. He knew the mystery and the pathos of 'the man

<sup>1</sup> W. M. Mackay, *Bible Types of Modern Men*, ii. 51.



who never had a chance,' and yet He believed in the Fatherhood of God. He saw these problems, He felt them keenly, and yet He has told us this story to teach us to believe and to see the 'bright light that is in this cloud.'

That light is briefly this, that in estimating the value of our life at the last God will look not at the quantity, or even at the quality, of the work we do, but at the motive which inspires it.

(2) Besides that thought of a future redress of the world's sad lots, there is, however, another suggested in this story in regard to the quality of the work of the eleventh-hour labourer. His work will sometimes be found to be of a richer quality than that of the other. Wordsworth had this in his mind when he spoke of himself as an 'Idler in the land,' reaping 'the harvest of a quiet eye.'

Sometimes in a noble piece of music there is a break in the melody. You are puzzled a while. The old sweetness is lost. It has given place to harsh discords that have no connexion with the piece. But by and by the old theme is taken up—the old, and yet not the old. Strangely and subtly have these discords entered the harmony, there is a richness in the music not known before.

So has it been with life's noblest workers. Paul is driven into Arabia just as he receives his vision of Christ. Sore must these years of waiting have been to an ardent spirit like his. But they were not lost. They were the secret of that grand unity with which his life marched like a great drama to its close. No hesitations with him such as we find with Peter. He had settled these questions long ago. The time was now come to work them into practical life.

Nay, is it not true in a deep sense that the Master Himself was a 'Worker of the eleventh hour'? Into three years was pressed the work of a life that was to regenerate the world. And where were the other thirty passed? In the obscure toil of a carpenter. Who shall tell the trial of these waiting years?

When we have learned to compute our brother's service in the light of his opportunity rather than of its amount, we have not only in practical fashion brought the Kingdom of God a little nearer to him, we have ourselves more truly entered into its spirit.

#### QUINQUAGESIMA.

#### The Practicability of the Law of Love.

'Love never faileth.'—I Co 13<sup>8</sup> (R.V.).

That may mean either that love never gives up, but always goes on trying; or it may mean that

love will always win in the end. It is true in both senses. But it is in the latter sense that we wish particularly to speak of it here.

We may have our uncertainties as to not a few matters in regard to the Christian origins—but there is one thing we cannot doubt if we are observant and honest men and women, and that is that the Spirit of Christ is within reach. Within reach—because it has reached: because of the transforming and life-changing and happiness-giving effect it has had on the best lives in history and on many lives that we know.

In her beautiful last letter quoted in 'A Portrait,' Anne Douglas Sedgwick wrote:

'So life is a *queer* struggle!

'Yet it remains *mine* and *beautiful* to me, and I often know *such* joy—in *feeling* the love about me, in loving, in *knowing* that I lie in the hand of God. . . .

'When you wrote—"your spirit can surmount anything"—I felt a strange tremor of response from an indomitable thread of life within me: *mine*, says Max Plowman: but I feel it *communicated*, from God, through His potent eyes as I look into them every evening, in silence.'

As a writer in the religious Press has said, 'It is a conviction—this availability of the Spirit of Christ—occasional and momentary with some, perpetual and ever-present with others. But with all dead certain. If only the great politicians and those who have the affairs of nations in their hands: if only the Press and those who have unrivalled chances of moulding public opinion: if only orators and preachers and those who call themselves Christians—if only all these could realize that all their problems, so manifestly created by fear, mistrust, greed, pride, and selfishness, have one solution only—the Spirit of Love with which neither fear, nor mistrust, nor greed, nor pride and selfishness can live.'

If Christ can completely change the life and outlook of an individual, He can change the life and outlook of nations: for the nation is only the individual writ large.

Why, then, is this way never taken or, at least, tried? It could not possibly be a greater failure than all other known ways have proved. It is not enough to say that the reason is that the nations have not as yet a common Christian basis. As a matter of fact it is not necessary to call oneself a Christian in order to be one. But though this is deeply and fundamentally and unescapably a religious matter, it need not be presented as such. It can be presented in the light of mere common

sense that in every way it pays better, offers better results, to live by the Law of Love. Why is it, then, that it is never tried? France is afraid of Germany—all the more now. And that is because, during the past years, the French have deliberately made Germany afraid of France.

At least part of the reason is that we don't understand what 'Love' means. We are afraid of it. We don't see that to love intensely means to love more widely; that to love one much—our own country, or our own mother, or motherland, or our friend—is to love others, not less, but more, if love is true to itself. No love of any kind, romantic or otherwise, that is content to remain exclusive has the seeds of permanence in it. 'For we must share, if we would keep, such is the law of love.'

The very founts of love in us  
Will soon be parched and dry.

We have got to rescue this great, cardinal word of Christ—'love'—from its identification with weakness. As it is with prayer (as Meredith says so truly), 'the failure of so much of our prayer is that we come to God in our weakness, and not in our strength.' It is not quite a man's job: or only the weak man's job—the job of the man who is beaten to his knees. Whereas, in very truth, it is the chief secret of the strength of the strong: the key to victory quite as much as the lever of rescue from defeat. So with love. The world hadn't a word for what Christ meant by it, so the New Testament had to invent one. The New Testament word for love, and with which its pages are saturated and redolent, one hardly finds in classic Greek at all.

And what did Christ mean by it? It is concrete, clear-cut, businesslike, practical, with its head in heaven yet with its feet very firmly planted on this solid earth. It is this: 'Do unto others as ye would that they should do to you'—everywhere and in every thing. A final, inflexible, unmistakable, unequivocal rule of life—for everybody: and within everybody's reach and capacity. A universal law, an individual law: as applicable to, and practical for, any and every man, woman, or child, as for every nation or race, White, Red, Yellow, or Black. That is 'love' in the New Testament. 'Thereon hang all the law and the prophets,' as Christ adds.

Love may, and does, mean many other things, but fundamentally that is the Law of Love. It sounds old and commonplace, a little trite. But little tried. Commonplace, but unhappily not

common. Simple: but heaven-reaching and earth-transforming. The one secret of true and happy success, in business, in family life, in social life, in the many and often perplexing problems of individual life: in civic life, in national life: in Labour problems: in international life, in world-life. This is the Law of Love. And it means the end of hate (personal and national), of greed, of suspicion, of jealousy, of selfishness—we do not say of the inevitable advance of civilization—though it will unarguably govern the whole contact and relation of dominant with lower peoples: *and the end of war.* It is the Law of Love, relieved of all the misty romance and impracticability that is popularly associated with it. It is simple, unequivocal, and universally available. And it is a man's rule: for it will take all a man to carry it out.

But the world will say to us, 'This is all very well: but it would be more convincing to us if you Christians tried it on yourselves and proved its practicability there. Look at the divisions and—not to put too fine a point on it—the bitternesses and antagonisms between the Churches!' It is a pertinent and humiliating point. Now in the religious journal from which we quoted earlier there is a very varied and interesting account of the work, and achievements, of the Oxford Group Movement. One of the results of that Movement—and by no means the least—is the way in which the Law of Love is breaking down the barriers and dissolving the hostilities between the churches.

But there is more evidence than that of the practicability of the Law of Love, and of the Law of Love alone proving the solvent of the world-problem, too. As this extract from an article in a leading organ of the Canadian Press suggests: 'When the established authorities speak on problems of unemployment, privation, and general distress, it has become the habit to say that there is no ready solution, no panacea. The Oxford Group are boldly prepared to affirm that the immediate solution is at hand. It is no less than to put the Law of Love into practice now, without waiting for some one else to do something.' That is not a discovery of the Oxford Group. It is the essence of Christianity.

In her latest novel *Time Piece*, Miss Naomi Jacob records a talk between Claudia (the heroine) and Hugh. "The real ideas last—because they are fundamentally sound."

"What kind of ideas—last, Hugh?"

"Well, mostly the thoughts that are ascribed to—to Jesus of Nazareth."



'Then, stretching out his hand and laying it on hers, he continued: "Don't think that I am being anything but severely practical, and don't think that I am trying to sound—good or even religious—but I believe that the world could be run on these lines if only we had enough pluck to try."'

There are people who fight shy of Christ, because they are afraid that He asks too much. It is true that in the end He asks for everything: but what some people seem unaware of is that He does not necessarily ask for it all at once, and that He is

prepared to take anything that any one offers Him, or to give anything that any one asks of Him. Let us start with one thing at a time, if we can't start with two. Prayer may be difficult, to begin with, even the reality of prayer, and the 'Group' doctrine of 'guidance' unconvincing. Start where it is possible. Start always with the Law of Love, which is not difficult, at least to try, and is contingent on no theories of the spiritual universe, like prayer: and, in the end, includes all the rest, 'for the greatest of these is love.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> H. E. Brierley, *Freedom and Faith*, 143.

## The Parable of the Good Samaritan.

BY THE REVEREND W. J. MASSON, B.D., EDINBURGH.

THE usual interpretation of this parable treats it as our Lord's answer to the second question put to Him by the lawyer, 'And who is my neighbour?' It is certainly that, but when we consider some of His replies to other questions, we see that His habit was to go farther and to seize the opportunity to add important teaching upon some related matter. For example, when the priests asked Him whether it was lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar, He not only answered in the affirmative but continued, 'And to God the things which are God's.' So when He was asked to interfere in the division of the inheritance, He refused, but went on to read the petitioner a sharp lesson on the dangers of covetousness. Similarly then we should expect that Christ's aim in this story was not only to make clear who is to be regarded as our neighbour but also to add some important relevant truth.

To see what that extra lesson is, let us first note the *Dramatis Personæ* of the tale. The selection is not accidental. Our Lord might have chosen any three men if His point were merely to represent the needy as our neighbour. He might have made the story an attack upon His enemies by introducing Pharisees in contrast with the Samaritan. He might have indulged in a dig at His questioner by giving us a lawyer and a scribe. Instead, He chose a priest and a Levite. Why? And why should the third actor be a Samaritan, not a Jew? These are questions which have not been considered sufficiently though they go to the root of the message of the parable, for Christ must have had some reason for His selection. The suggestion of this essay would be that it was in order to extend His

answer so as not merely to say that every one in need is to be regarded as a neighbour but also to lay down the principle that our duty to our neighbour must take precedence of all else, that even where our duty to God clashes with it, our duty to our neighbour must come first.

Put thus, the suggestion may sound somewhat startling but it is an obvious corollary to the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, of the love of God, for what father, who really did not need anything from his children, would not heartily approve if a son kept back from him in order to help his needy brother? Moreover, our Lord taught this plainly on other occasions. Suppose a man vows to give a hundred pounds to God at the end of the year. Before that date, however, his father becomes seriously ill and requires an expensive operation. This hundred pounds is all they have to enable them to meet that cost. Must the man keep his vow to God or can he break it and use the money to help his father? That was really the question of Corban. The Pharisees held that he must fulfil his vow and our Lord denounced them in no measured terms. Again, there was the matter of the Sabbath Day. The Pharisees maintained that it was God's day and must be given wholly to Him. Any work, even the healing of the sick, must be left till at sunset the holy day reached its close. Again it was in no measured terms that our Lord denounced such teaching, implying, as it did, that His Father would set His rights before the relief of human suffering. Our duty to our needy neighbour takes precedence of all else, even of our duty to God.

How then does the parable of the Good Samaritan teach this? Let us make two assumptions. First, that the priest and the Levite were travelling toward Jerusalem. This does not really matter for a priest was always a priest wherever he went, but it makes the point clearer for they would be going up to take their turn in officiating at the Temple. Even if they were leaving Jerusalem, however, after having fulfilled their period of service, they would still be a priest and a Levite, not ordinary men. The second assumption is so obvious that it would scarcely need to be mentioned if it had not been consistently ignored. The robbers, we are told, departed, 'leaving him half dead.' We may take it, therefore, that he would look as if he were dead, and may picture him lying in the ditch at the road-side, face down, motionless. There would be no way of telling whether he were alive or dead *till one had turned him over*. That is the point to be noted. Before the priest or the Levite could help the stricken man, before they could tell whether or not he was beyond the need of human help, they would have to touch him and they might find that he was dead, which would be a very serious matter for them, as it would mean that they had handled a corpse.

That this was regarded as particularly defiling, is seen from the rules for cleansing as given in Nu 19<sup>11-22</sup>. These are peculiarly stringent, for while the ceremony is to be carried out on the third day, the person is not held to be clean till the seventh day, and failure to carry out the rules entails the penalty of expulsion, vv. 12 and 20. That was in the case of the ordinary Jew. But what of the priest? In Lev 21<sup>1f</sup>. we read (R.V.), 'And the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto the priests the sons of Aaron, and say unto them, There shall none defile himself for the dead among his people; except for his kin, that is near unto him,' etc. That is sufficiently emphatic, and Ezekiel in his picture of the new Jerusalem repeats the prohibition, 'And they (the priests) shall come at no dead person to defile themselves: but for father,' etc. (44<sup>25</sup> R.V.). There was no need for our Lord to refer to these rules. They were familiar to all His hearers and in the light of them, these could well understand why the priest was so anxious to avoid such defilement, especially if he were on his way to Jerusalem to take up his duties in the Temple. He would keep as far away as possible. The rules for the Levite were not so strict, so that he could venture to approach, but dared not touch. Even the ordinary Jew might well hesitate to incur such penalty for an unknown stranger, but a Samaritan would have no such scruples. Hence the actors in the drama, a priest, a Levite and a Samaritan.

Much has been said of the callousness of the priest and the Levite. The late Professor A. B. Bruce, for example, in his *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, wrote, 'Inhuman, unnatural conduct, one is ready to exclaim. It was inhuman, but it was not unnatural. These men did exactly what all the world is inclined to do; what the majority are doing in one form or another every day—passing by need without giving pity time to rise in the bosom—what every one will certainly do in whom the impulses of fear and the instinct of self-preservation are stronger than the nobler instincts and impulses of benevolence' (p. 348). (This last clause refers to the theory that the priest and the Levite did not want to interfere with the work of the bandits in case they themselves were involved in a similar fate.) Later he adds, 'They too (as well as the Samaritan), perhaps felt a little pity, but it was just enough to scare them away in horror, and to send them on their journey inventing excuses to hide from themselves their own heartlessness' (p. 350). In a similar strain are the remarks of a recent writer in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES,<sup>1</sup> 'We need note only the significance of the priest and Levite who passed by the poor broken figure at the roadside. They are the experts of religion, men who are devoting their lives to religion. Their callousness is self-evident, and when they are contrasted with the kind-hearted and unselfish-spirited Samaritan, the lawyer has no other choice than to pass condemnation on them.'

That, however, is not at all a fair judgment, for the priest and the Levite were faced with a very real dilemma. Stanley Jones tells of a conference at which a Brahman remarked, 'We sincerely desire to help the low castes, but we must be mindful about our religion.' That would be exactly the feelings of these two. They would quite recognize that they had a duty to help their fellow in distress, but they would also recognize that they had a duty to God to keep themselves clean for His service. It was not callousness and lack of heart that made them pass by on the other side; it was concern for the commandments of their religion. They ought not to be accused of lack of religion, as is often done, but of too scrupulous obedience to its dictates as they understood these. Their duty to God and their duty to man clashed, and they set first what they deemed to be their duty to God. Christ does not say, in so many words, that they were wrong but the story implies it, that not only had they a duty to help the man in distress, but that such duty ought to come before every other thought and consideration. The closing words, 'Go thou and do likewise,' have a sharp ring about them.

<sup>1</sup> September 1936, p. 553.



Possibly they were snapped out to interrupt the lawyer who was going on to defend the action of the two defaulters, for we can easily understand the wrath which Christ would feel at the suggestion that His Father would demand that the afflicted should be left to perish rather than that His worship should be interfered with.

In the Greek Church there is a legend about her two saints, Cassianus and Nicholas. St. Cassianus enters Heaven and Christ asks, 'What hast thou seen on earth, Cassianus?' 'I saw,' the saint replies, 'a peasant floundering with his wagon in a marsh.' 'Did'st thou not help him?' 'No, for I was coming

before Thee and I was afraid of soiling my white robes.' By-and-by St. Nicholas arrives, all covered with mud and mire. 'Why so stained and soiled, Nicholas?' asks the Lord, and the saint replies, 'I saw a peasant floundering in a marsh and I put my shoulder to the wheel and helped him out.' And the Master's verdict is, 'Blessed art thou, Nicholas, Cassianus did well but thou hast done better.' Such is the legend, but this parable of the Good Samaritan teaches differently, showing that Christ's judgment would rather have been that St. Nicholas did right while St. Cassianus did wrong, absolutely wrong.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### Varia.

I HAVE found this book<sup>1</sup> more attractive and congenial than most of the German theological works which now come into my hands. It is well written and well arranged, and there is continuity and consistency in its argument. The author, himself a Lutheran, criticises the defects and the dangers of the exclusive emphasis on the doctrine of justification by faith as encouraging a low standard of Christian living, and commends the Reformed treatment of *office* in the Church. He warns against the evils of public confession, and yet writes appreciatively of the Group Movement in its demand for a changed life. The Faith and Order Movement had awakened an interest in the question of the Church, to which German theology had given relatively little attention; the Church controversy has made that interest acute. The argument may be summarily stated. The phrase, 'the divine secret,' is the author's rendering of the term *mystery* in the New Testament, the significance of which the word *secret* alone would not bring out. A human secret when disclosed ceases, the divine secret, even when revealed, is not exhausted; shadows still surround its brightness. This divine secret is God's own *dynamic immanence* in the world; the author asserts the divine transcendence against pantheism; but does not assent to the 'altogether otherness' of God of the Barthian theology. The

three propositions used in Luther's description of the presence of Christ in the elements, *in*, *with*, and *under*, are applied to indicate the characteristics of the divine secret—God in man, God apart from man, God hidden under man, to illustrate the principle in its application to Christology. Having thus laid the foundations, the author in three-fourths of the work applies the principle to the Church under three aspects, Word and Sacrament, the spiritual life, and the constitution of the Church. His tendency is, in a broad sense, 'high Church Protestantism.' His plea for reverence for the mother of our Lord as an instance of this divine secret might offend ultra Protestants; but seems to me reverent and reasonable. His insistence with so much Continental theology to-day on Satanic agency seems to me mistaken, as diverting attention from human responsibility for the evil thus explained. Throughout at each stage of his argument the author recognizes a dualism, the divine secret evoking the counter-attack of evil. His last pages are a moving 'cry from the depths' against 'the counter-church, and the lapse of the church.' I hope the book will soon be translated.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

IN the realm of Old Testament studies the dominant interest during the last generation has been in the Prophets. Yet there always seems to be room for fresh suggestion and for new interpretation. An

<sup>1</sup> *Vom göttlichen Geheimnis*, von Wilhelm Stählin (Johannes Stauda, Kassel).

interesting and original contribution to the subject is that of the Polish scholar, Abraham Heschel.<sup>1</sup> The author has a wide range of learning, and is well able to adduce parallels from many spheres. He knows and has carefully studied the literature of the subject; the big gap in his reading lies in English works. The fact suggests unfamiliarity with the language, for American and British scholars are freely mentioned when they write in, or have been translated into, German.

The first of the three divisions into which Heschel's work falls is devoted mainly to the criticism of various theories of prophetic inspiration, especially those which suggest kinship with the ecstatic and the poet. As compared with these, the prophetic inspiration is *sui generis*, a unique mode of divine communication and of human reception. It must be admitted that the author hardly understands the 'ecstatic' view as commonly presented, at least in this country, for he does not realize that it concerns merely the externals of prophetic activity, and insists that the real point at which the self-revealing divine impinges on the human soul is to be found in those deeper ranges of spiritual life which lie far below the level of normal consciousness. The revelation is unique, though manifested in forms which may be paralleled elsewhere. The second part of the work is an analysis of the prophetic experience itself, its impulses and its direction. The essence of it is best explained as a 'sympathy,' a sharing of the 'pathos' of God—not mere enthusiasm, passion, or imitation. The prophet, while maintaining his sense of personal identity, and in no way absorbed in mystical or pantheistic fashion, undergoes the very experience of God Himself, and thus expresses with infallible certainty the divine attitude to things human.

After an acute analytical discussion of this theory and of some of its implications, Heschel passes on to the theology resulting from it. His position is not always easy to understand, perhaps because of its originality, but he has certainly given us a book which will make us think, and which may yet prove to have made a contribution of far-reaching importance to the study of the revelation of God.

The progress made by the Jewish community in Palestine is one of the most striking features of the post-war world. Not only has advance been made in material things, in the reclamation of waste land, and the development of the country's resources, but already the young community has

shown signs of the development of a real and characteristic cultural life. Hebrew is once more a living, spoken language, and, though it has been compelled to advance far beyond its Biblical vocabulary, yet the classical form serves as an introduction which makes the common Jewish speech intelligible. We have already a literature, both secular and religious, and from time to time Jewish Palestinian scholars are making valuable contributions to the study of religion. One of the most recent manifestations of this tendency is to be seen in a book by Dr. A. Kaminka bearing the Latin title *Liber Assiri Salathielis*, and published at Tel-Aviv<sup>2</sup> this year. It is, of course, an edition of the book which most of us know under the title IV Esdras. Dr. Kaminka believes that the work was originally composed in Hebrew, and his 'retranslation' into that language certainly tends to bear out the theory, for it makes beautiful and smooth reading. Dr. Kaminka recognizes only chs. 3-14 of the well-known Latin version as being original, for it is these which form the real 'vision of Salathiel'; he includes, however, 'the missing fragment' (8<sup>20b-36</sup> of Bensly's edition, 6<sup>20-36</sup> of Kaminka's).

In addition to a translation into Hebrew, Dr. Kaminka has supplied a useful Introduction, and copious notes at the foot of each page. The latter take careful account of the textual variations in the Latin MSS and in the other versions, and include also explanatory notes and references to other literature, Biblical and non-Biblical. As was to be expected from a scholar of Dr. Kaminka's quality, the work is admirably done. It is a fine example of what the new Jewry can produce, and the only regret we can feel about it is that the language in which it is written limits very narrowly its appeal to the average reader in Western Europe.

T. H. ROBINSON.

Cardiff.

### The Old Testament and the New Jews.<sup>3</sup>

THIS is a significant reflection of Naziism reacting on theology. Professor Schmökel, a Roman Catholic teacher in Breslau University, hails with relief the German check to international Judaism with its demoralizing influences upon the nation

<sup>1</sup> *Sumtipus Societatis* 'Dvir.'

<sup>2</sup> *Altes Testament und Heutiges Judentum*, von Lic. Dr. Hartmut Schmökel (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen; M.1.50).

<sup>3</sup> *Die Prophetie* (Polskiej Akademji Umiejętności; Cracow).



(pp. 3, 22). But he will not have 'the Old Testament compromised or depreciated. This sacred book has, on its higher levels, elements which the Reich requires to assimilate. Thus, the simple tale of Creation is far superior to the mythology of the Edda (p. 7 f.). Modern Judaism 'has lost the Old Testament'; so far as it is religious at all, it is living on the Torah, not on the religion of the prophets and the psalmists. To compare this people, a mere *Gastvolk* in modern society, with the people of the Old Testament 'is a false comparison, which does wrong above all to the soul of Germany.' Christians alone have a right to the Old Testament, the author maintains, since they know how its real anticipations are to be fulfilled; modern Jews live in a defeatist world of their own, their literature being the Mishna and the Talmud. Hence those who belong to the line of Luther and Goethe may freely avail themselves of the Old Testament, which is too great a book to be ignored on account of its fortuitous association with contemporary Judaism.

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

## The Theology of the New Testament and Some Implications of the Christian Faith.

THE task of New Testament theology is to set forth the 'history of the Word of God' as this is found in the New Testament.

Professor Friedrich Büchsel takes this as his aim in *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*.<sup>1</sup> Rejecting the idea of coldly impartial inquiry as not only unattainable but even undesirable, he writes as a believer whose purpose is not merely historical but, in the strictest sense of the word, theological, that is, to speak of God. The result is a short, attractive book which presents its subject in a form easy to survey as a whole, while giving at the same time what is virtually a separate theology of each separate part of the New Testament—the Synoptists, John, Paul—the Pastorals and the Apocalypse being omitted. Each is allowed to give its own message with its own peculiar emphasis, while the fundamental unity of the whole is clearly shown. Explanatory notes and references are relegated to the end so as not to burden the text, which itself keeps close to the sources.

The dominant theme of the whole is found in the reality of the Messiahship of Jesus. In the Synoptic

<sup>1</sup> Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; M. 6 and 7.50.

Gospels Jesus appears primarily in the prophetic succession, preaching repentance. The 'mystery of the Kingdom' and the 'Messianic secret' are a real mystery and a real secret, only to be apprehended by those who have 'ears to hear,' that is, those who make the right response to the demand for repentance. But it is Messiahship which fundamentally distinguishes Jesus from the prophets; the response made to His message is decisive for eternity. In the Fourth Gospel there is no 'secret'; Jesus is Son of God and announces this Himself. Here, too, the attitude taken up to Him is decisive for eternity. Paul, again, finds his dominant theme in the crucified and exalted Son of God.

Dr. Büchsel finds no place for Hellenistic influence in the New Testament message. Not metaphysical speculation nor mysticism, but personal religion is the secret of the whole. From this point of view his discussion of the Fourth Gospel is particularly interesting, where he insists that the relation of the Son to the Father is personal, not metaphysical.

Only rarely the special interests of the author or the problems of modern Germany give a hint of their existence, as perhaps in the rejection of the *Führerprinzip* as totally inapplicable to Christianity, and possibly in the author's almost too obvious conviction that 'faith without works is dead.' His insistence that 'justification by faith' is only part of the Apostle's doctrine, and subordinate at that, is intended as a salutary warning to the Evangelical Church, but almost requires correction in the opposite direction in this country.

If Dr. Büchsel is not directly concerned with modern problems, Carl Ludwig Runge<sup>2</sup> most definitely is. The rise of neo-paganisms in Germany, which accuse Christianity of a false other-worldliness, demands, as Dr. Althaus says in his preface, that we 'strive anew to understand God in Nature and Nature in God.' And this Runge attempts to do, finding his solution in the Bible view of the world, though not by way of a fundamentalist approach. Some readers may find his arguments difficult to accept, but they are at least stimulating, and his conclusion is certainly right.

The actual experience of man in relation to Nature he finds to be conditioned by the fact that he is at once part and parcel of it, and at the same time is continually striving to master it. And his attempts to do this are doomed to fail. If he employs magic, it degenerates into black magic; if scientific method, this threatens to overwhelm

<sup>2</sup> *Das Reich Gottes und die Reiche der Natur* (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; M.2).

the civilization based upon it. Hence arises the tragedy of man's relation to Nature; but the root of it is in man's heart. Nature is not itself evil, but its disharmony is due to the evil, that is, selfish will of man, which attempts to use for its own ends what was designed for the will of God. It is, as created by God, good; and even though 'fallen' the will of God is directing it towards redemption.

Christ is the Saviour of the natural world. He entered completely into it, but approached it in complete harmony with the will of God, and so

evoked from it a perfect response. In regard to this, Runge has thought-provoking things to say of the parables of Nature and the Nature miracles. The kingdoms of Nature, he holds, are part of the Kingdom of God, which works in and through them.

The conclusion is that Christians who have received the first-fruits of the Spirit of Christ, are neither to deify Nature nor to treat it as diabolical, but to sanctify it with thanksgiving and joy.

PHILIP S. WATSON.

Leeds.

## Contributions and Comments.

### 'The Kingdom of God has come.'

THE grammatical argument which Mr. Campbell advances (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, November 1936) against the new exegesis of Mk 9<sup>1</sup> lately advocated by my friend and colleague, Professor C. H. Dodd (*Parables of the Kingdom*, pp. 42, 53, 54), is, I think, as he claims, 'conclusive.' Usage seems to show that *ιδεῖν* is not constructed with an accusative and a participle when *ιδεῖν* has the force which Professor Dodd wishes to ascribe to it in Mk 9<sup>1</sup>, namely, 'to recognize,' 'to perceive.' When *ιδεῖν* means 'to perceive,' the fact-perceived is normally expressed by a *ὅτι* clause. But the exegetical point is of such high importance for the meaning of the Kingdom of God in the Gospels generally that it is perhaps not superfluous to call attention to other considerations which appear to be scarcely less decisive against the new rendering than Mr. Campbell's appeal to syntax.

Professor Dodd translates Mk 9<sup>1</sup> thus: 'There are some of those standing here who will not taste of death, until they have seen that the kingdom of God has come with power.' He adds: 'the meaning appears to be that some of those who heard Jesus speak would before their death awake to the fact that the kingdom of God had come' (p. 54). Moreover, if we are to satisfy Professor Dodd's contention that the passage does not conflict with the view that in the Gospels the Kingdom is always thought of as already present, it seems necessary to suppose that Jesus meant that the Kingdom had in truth come when He was speaking. The Professor himself mentions and perhaps favours this view, but he does not definitely

commit himself to it: 'The only open question,' he writes, 'is whether Jesus meant that the kingdom had already in His ministry come "with power," and that His hearers would afterwards recognize the fact, or whether He intended to distinguish its partial coming from some subsequent coming "with power."' There seem to be difficulties about both these alternatives. We will go back to the underlying interpretation which Professor Dodd has adopted. Is it possible?

Let us first notice that if Mark really meant what Professor Dodd suggests, his meaning was either missed or deliberately altered by the other two synoptic Evangelists. Matthew (16<sup>28</sup>) substitutes for *τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐληλυθῆσαν ἐν δυνάμει* the words *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ*. Here it is certain that *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is the direct object of *ἰδωσιν*, and that *ἐρχόμενον* refers to an event which from the point of view of the Speaker was in the future. Luke simply omits the words *ἐληλυθῆσαν ἐν δυνάμει*. It is at least arguable that Luke did this in order to mitigate the difficulty which the saying would occasion to a second generation which was still awaiting the coming 'in power.' But whatever meaning Luke may have thought that the words 'before they see the kingdom of God' might bear, the saying, as he reports it, certainly declares that the bystanders will see, before they die, what they have not seen yet. Here, as in Jn 3<sup>3</sup> (a noteworthy parallel for the phrase), *βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ* must be direct object of the verb *ιδεῖν*.

Nor can I agree that it is at all less certain that in Mk 9<sup>1</sup> the reference is to an event thought of as future. The context as well as the grammar



makes this clear. Mk 9<sup>1</sup> must be read with Mk 8<sup>38</sup>. Now in Mk 8<sup>38</sup> we have a contrast between present and future: he who is now, in this adulterous and sinful generation, ashamed of the Son of Man and His words, will find that the Son of Man will be ashamed of him, when He is come (ὅταν ἔλθῃ) in the glory of His Father with the holy angels. Thus the language forbids the supposition that the Son of Man is already present 'in the glory of His Father.' That event is yet to come. The question naturally arises: 'When will this be?' The tacit question is answered in 9<sup>1</sup>: 'Some of those standing here will see it before they die.' This gives a perfectly good and natural connexion, and it is the only interpretation which does justice to the passage as a whole. Even if Professor Dodd's exegesis were syntactically acceptable it would remain exposed to the objection that it intrudes an idea which, here at least, is alien. What would be the point of saying in this connexion: 'Some of those who hear me speak will, before they die, awake to the fact that the kingdom of God has come'? The context taken as a whole requires us to assume that, when Jesus spoke, the coming of the Kingdom was thought of as future.

Lest it be supposed that the perfect participle ἐληλυθῆσαν occasions any objection to this interpretation, let me cite two synoptic parallels:

(i) In Mk 11<sup>20</sup> we read that the disciples, having previously heard Jesus curse the fig-tree, were later at the same spot, and there εἶδον τὴν συκὴν ἐξηραμμένην ἐκ ῥιζῶν. This is correctly translated in A.V. and R.V., 'They saw the fig-tree dried up (R.V. withered away) from the roots.' The Greek does not mean: 'the disciples perceived that the fig-tree *had been* withered away (when they were at the spot before).' συκὴν is direct object of εἶδον. This is shown both by the participial construction and by the exclamation of Peter which follows: ἰδε ἡ συκὴ ἣν κατηράσω ἐξήρανται. On the other hand, the disciples did not see the fig-tree wither—that would have required the present participle ξηραίνόμενον. The withering had already taken place. But the participle, though perfect, explains what the disciples actually saw, namely, the tree withered.

(ii) In Mt 8<sup>14</sup> we read that Jesus entered Peter's house at Capernaum where εἶδεν τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτοῦ βεβλημένην καὶ πυρέσσουσαν. Here the distinction of tense between βεβλημένην and πυρέσσουσαν is not without meaning: Peter's mother-in-law was in a fever and she had been laid out on a bed; but both participles, the perfect no less than the present, help to describe what Jesus actually saw.

So it is in Mk 9<sup>1</sup>. The perfect ἐληλυθῆσαν is not quite equivalent to a present. It means not 'coming' but 'arrived and present.' The English Versions quite correctly mark the distinction between ἐρχόμενον in Mt 16<sup>28</sup>, which they render 'coming,' and ἐληλυθῆσαν in Mk 9<sup>1</sup>, which they render 'come.' The difference though slight is real. But both in Matthew and in Mark, Jesus must be understood to refer to a coming which is conceived of as future. When Jesus speaks the Kingdom of God may be 'at hand,' 'at the doors,' but it has not yet 'come in power.'

J. M. CREED.

St. John's College, Cambridge.

### A Further Note on the 'Salt' Section at the end of Mark ix.

I SUPPOSE it was almost the last article that I wrote in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES on the text of the New Testament which dealt with one particular section of Mark's Gospel and was headed in the terms, 'An Unrecognized Latinism in St. Mark.' There could hardly be a doubt as to the Latinism, for it was the key to the understanding of the last verse of the chapter (Mk 9<sup>50</sup>). When we were told to 'have salt in ourselves, and to be at peace with one another,' to understand this rightly we had to remind ourselves that (in idiomatic Latin) the word for *Salt* was in the accusative not *Sal* but *Salem*, and that the writer, whoever he was, of this verse contrasted *salt* and *peace* and made them correlative one with the other. It was a play upon words which was only possible if the speaker was by education bi-lingual or perhaps even tri-lingual in addressing his audience, for I assume that an address is involved. He spoke Latin as well as either Greek or Hebrew. This unsuspected Latinism was verified for us by the fact that in the Latin text of the Codex Bezae we actually found *salem* used and not *sal*. Moreover, almost the whole body of the Latin versions follow the same line as the Codex Bezae; that is, the Latin tradition of Mark from the beginning treats the *sal* as masculine, and I think we ought to admit that the speaker whose discourse is here summarized was also in the habit of using this form.

I think it would be difficult to overestimate the importance of these discoveries, but they need to be followed up, and I put down here a few notes of what follows from a closer investigation of the matter in hand. First of all, this group of 'salt' texts are part of a discourse. Second, it is not St. Mark's discourse, for you find fragments of the

same 'salt' homily in Matthew and in Luke. But if it was not St. Mark's play upon words, it must have been a paranomasia due to the original speaker; and therefore in the third place we have portions of an actual sermon by our Lord Himself, of which sermon the parts preserved by Mark are the headlines of some reporter or shorthand-writer who was taking down eagerly the teaching to which he was listening. This is very important, and it suggests to us that we have now got behind St. Mark as a traditional interpreter and have got into somebody else's notebook. We should say openly that these last phrases and whatever belongs with them are a detached leaf from another source, and they should be printed separately by spacing of the text with the heading referring them to our Lord Himself, or they should be printed as an appendix at the end of the Gospel and recognised in this way as an original composition, a fragment of the discourses of Jesus Christ. The importance of this is evident. It will be a little difficult for us to print the Greek Testament so as to bring out the Latinism, but we must try to do so. It will not do to print *salem* in Greek letters, although we have plenty of evidence that *salem* meant *peace* both to the writers of the sermons and to our Lord Himself, as well as to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. We have to use a bi-lingual type and print *salem* in Latin type, with the marginal explanation that it is really Greek.

I shall be glad to know what further confirmation has been found of this method of inquiry. We want to know more about the historical composition of what we call the Gospels. Here is a specimen with which to begin. It is worth while following up the clue in order that we may see where it will lead us. Our Lord Himself is known to have used philological interpretation based on the early explanation of the Jewish doctors that the name Jerusalem meant 'they shall see peace,' and when He wept over the city His tears have stained the Gospel text, as when He says, 'the things that belong to thy peace are now hid from thine eyes.'

Perhaps this will be sufficient for the beginning of a new commentary upon the Gospel of Mark. Curiously, it is not long since Mr. H. G. Wood published in *The Friend* a discourse on *Salt* in which he discussed in detail the virtues and qualities of that mineral, and ended by giving an explanation that having salt in ourselves meant having peace with one another; and thus borrowing from Mark he missed the explanation which was involved in our detected Latinism. J. RENDEL HARRIS.

Birmingham.

[Many years ago Dr. Hastings wrote to Dr. Rendel Harris: 'I shall publish everything you can send me.' This magazine has had the benefit of many of Dr. Harris' discoveries, and the Editors rejoice that he is able after his long illness to contribute again. On another page in this issue is Mr. Phillips' account of the oldest Biblical papyrus. This, too, we owe to Dr. Rendel Harris, who bought it in 1917 in a bundle of miscellaneous papyri.]

### A Study in Mysticism.

DR. GRETA HORT has produced a most ingenious and interesting study of mystical experience—*Sense and Thought: A Study in Mysticism* (Allen & Unwin; 8s. 6d. net). Combining a real sympathy for her subject-matter with a thorough knowledge of modern experimental psychology, and using as her text the greatest work of English mediæval mysticism, 'The Cloud of Unknowing,' her book is one which no student of the theology and psychology of prayer can ignore. Those who, like the present reviewer, are unable to agree with the writer's philosophic assumptions and feel that at several points these have led her to misunderstand the plain meaning of her text, must nevertheless be grateful for the skilful and detailed interpretation which she has given to us; and the new light which—by approaching the subject from a fresh angle—she has thrown upon the mental and moral phenomena associated with contemplative prayer.

Dr. Hort's great strength lies in her psychological knowledge and insight; and it is because of this that she is able to show the realistic character of the descriptions of religious experience in the 'Cloud,' and suggest the way in which they should be understood. She begins with an admirable discussion of the imaginative element in religious experience; the rich variety of accidental forms provided by the religious convictions or sensory experiences of the subject, and the single substantial truth which these sensible and imaginative vehicles convey. Especially valuable here is her brilliant demonstration of the place of kinæsthetic experiences in our religious apprehensions, and the large part which these play even in those which we like to regard as purely spiritual. Thus she points out, and makes clear by illustrations drawn from musical and other types of experience, that the language of movement and contact—the 'stirring of the soul,' the 'lifting' of the heart,



the 'touch' of the Divine—so constantly found in the mystics, is to be understood as an attempt towards the realistic description of religious experience. For this, while in its essence 'beyond sense,' has yet, because of the unity of soul and body, its repercussions within the sensory field. So the prayer of the writer of the 'Cloud' 'was not like lifting up his heart to God, nor as if he lifted up his heart; it was quite simply one of lifting the heart up to God.' To this we must add, that a Catholic Christian accustomed to hear, or, if a priest, to say, the *Sursum Corda* at least once a week, would find upon his lips the very words which expressed this obscure movement of the soul; and that these words with their associated suggestions would tend to produce, or at least give more vivid expression to, the experience which they describe.

As nearly always in modern studies of mediæval mysticism, the importance of its liturgical background has escaped Dr. Hort's notice, though she is well acquainted with its literary and theological sources, and uses them with skill. In fact, in her natural eagerness to prove that the 'Cloud' is the work of a good Monist, and that the 'God as He is in Himself,' on whom the writer's love is set, is the same thing as 'the spirit of totality,' she seems to forget that this is a Christian work, taking for granted the Christian view of the Divine Nature, and therefore feeling no need to restate it. Hence she finds no difficulty in making the writer of the 'Cloud' preach her philosophic gospel instead of his own. Her statement that though he doubtless believed in the Creeds they 'had no interest for him' would shock him very much if he could hear it; for as a matter of fact the metaphysical landscape which those creeds imply is far greater in scope and richer in content than that of his commentator. What we miss here is the sense of the over-againstness of the Supernatural; the Holy and the Living God in His distinctness—personal and yet transcendent, unknowable and yet present, seeking and touching the soul and awaking its love and desire—who is the God of Christian theism, but not, to take the words from Pascal's lips, 'the God of philosophers and scholars.' The account on p. 256 of the conception of God implied by the teaching in the 'Cloud' is really indistinguishable from pantheism; but it is only achieved by reading the work in the light of modern monistic philosophy. Thus we cannot agree that the writer was really in the 'same tradition' as Bradley and Bosanquet, or tried to communicate the same reality. Dr. Hort's attempt to prove

this is a brave one; but in the teeth of the facts of mystical experience it cannot succeed.

EVELYN UNDERHILL.

London.

## Prophet and Priest in Old Israel.

WE are glad to give the following letter from Dr. Welch. His *Prophet and Priest in Old Israel* was reviewed for THE EXPOSITORY TIMES by Dr. T. H. Robinson, who now replies to the point raised by Dr. Welch.—EDITOR.

The S.C.M. has sent me your review of my last book in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. I don't want to bother you or myself with a review of your review. What worries me is a single statement at the beginning of your review, where you say that 'I found it impossible to believe that the centralization of worship was possible in Josiah's reign.' I should be very glad to have your authority for this (to me) astounding statement of my position on this question. To give only one sentence which will show how entirely you have misinterpreted that position, I need only refer you to p. 1 of *Deuteronomy: The Framework to the Code*, 'It is generally held that the Code was made the official document which regulated the worship of Judah at the time when Josiah made the Jerusalem people the only legitimate place for sacrifice and festival.' What I deny is that the Code was revised in order to adapt it for the purpose of centralization. Further, I wrote an article in *Z.A.W.* to prove that the description of the sanctuary in Dt 12<sup>5</sup> appears in connexion with the centralization under Josiah. Finally, I wrote a couple of other articles to point out that Josiah had a double aim in his policy of centralization. He aimed at centralization of worship and at restoring the unity of Israel. His purpose was political and religious.

I need hardly point out that this initial mistake on your part as to my position about Josiah vitiates your entire criticism.

ADAM C. WELCH.

Edinburgh.

I have to thank you for forwarding to me Dr. Welch's reply to my criticism of his *Prophet and Priest in Old Israel*, and my gratitude is due also to Dr. Welch for having written it. The world of Old Testament scholarship is not a debating society, where the aim of the participants is to score points over their adversaries, but a company of fellow-workers, who are trying, in co-operation, to reach

a fuller understanding of the meaning and message of Scripture. It is of the highest importance that there should be a clear comprehension of any view propounded, especially when it comes from a scholar of the rank and experience of Dr. Welch. I am, therefore, particularly grateful to Dr. Welch for correcting a misapprehension as to his position which is by no means confined to myself.

The remark to which Dr. Welch takes exception referred solely to his *Code of Deuteronomy*, and was based on a general impression of his work. He appeared there to sympathize to a large extent with the difficulties felt by Hölischer on the 'regnant hypothesis,' though he proposed a very different solution. Further, such remarks as those on Tithes (p. 42 f.), the Passover (p. 72), the Feast of Weeks (p. 81 f.), and the general attitude of the Book of Deuteronomy (p. 195), while designed to show that Deuteronomy could not reasonably have demanded centralization, are equally applicable to *any* attempt to concentrate the cultus, whether made by Josiah or another, unless we are to suppose, with Hölischer, that it was made at a time when the Jewish community was confined to a very small district, and limited to a few square miles in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem.

As I say, I am glad to have this misunderstanding cleared up. But it concerned only Dr. Welch's *Code of Deuteronomy*, and I confess that I do not see how it bears on my remarks concerning his last book. Adherents of the 'regnant hypothesis' were conscious of the difference between, shall we say, Hosea and Ezra, but found the link between the two conceptions of religion in Deuteronomy and Ezekiel. Unless Dr. Welch has been far more seriously misunderstood than he suspects, his view is that the Code of Deuteronomy belongs to a much earlier period than the seventh century, and that there is, therefore, a gap between the pre-exilic prophets and the post-exilic priestly religion. As I understand *Prophet and Priest in Old Israel*, its object was to show how that gap might be bridged without the aid of Deuteronomy. While conscious of difficulties in the accepted position, I felt, and still feel, that, on the whole, it is a good deal more satisfactory than the reconstruction proposed by Dr. Welch.

T. H. ROBINSON.

Cardiff.

for August, reminds one of the description of the appearance of St. Paul—certainly very ancient and very probably authentic—given in the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*. 'A man small in size, bald-headed, bow-legged, well-built, with eyebrows meeting, full of grace. For sometimes he seemed like a man, and sometimes he had the countenance of an angel.' Surely that last sentence depicts the very beauty of holiness shining through homely or unattractive features!

D. R. FOTHERINGHAM.

*The Vicarage, Charing, Kent.*

## The Priscillianist Prologues.

MAY I venture to draw attention to one point which Dr. Howard appears to have overlooked in his lucid and valuable contribution to your September issue on the *Anti-Marcionite Prologues to the Gospels*? On p. 534, section I. (2), he refers to the widely diffused set of Gospel Prologues that were discussed by Corssen in 1896; and he writes of them: 'Corssen had proved that [these] Prologues . . . were Monarchian in character. . . . They bear clear traces of a modalist-monarchian doctrine. Harnack argued that Rome was the most likely place, during the pontificate of Zephyrinus (A.D. 198-217).' But it should be noted that among those who specially studied these very obscure Prologues, Corssen's view of their *provenance* no longer holds the field. In 1908, Dom John Chapman, in his *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels*, made out a very strong case for their being the work of the Spanish heretic Priscillian, who suffered at the stake in A.D. 385, and argued that they were to be dated therefore in the latter half of the fourth century. (A slight modification of the thesis made by Dom G. Morin, that the Prologues were written by Instantius, who defended Priscillian at the Council of Bordeaux in A.D. 384-5, need not concern us here.) As far as I am aware, this thesis has not been in essence challenged. It is accepted, e.g., by Burkitt (*J.T.S.*, x. 1908-9, p. 282) and Loofs (*Theophilus von Antioch adversus Marcionem*, 1930, p. 159 n.), as well as (virtually) by Harnack (*Die älteste Ev. Prol.*, etc., 1928, p. 3), and de Bruyne himself (*Rev. Bénéd.*, 1928, p. 210 f., esp. the footnote on the *Beginnings of Christianity*).

The point is of considerable importance, since, as Dr. Howard observes, this set of Prologues is clearly dependent on the Anti-Marcionite ones; and

## The Appearance of St. Paul.

THE beautiful description of the personal appearance of our Saviour, quoted in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES



if the (so-called) Monarchian collection could be really assigned to the pontificate of Zephyrinus, we should have incontestable evidence for the primitive dating of the earlier set. I do not doubt that de Bruyne and Harnack are right in their early date for the Anti-Marcionite Prologues; but there is no single piece of evidence that is as convincing as would be the Zephyrinic dating of the Monarchian set.

F. L. CROSS.

*Pusey House, Oxford.*

## At the Feast of Booths.

WITH regard to Rev. Thomas Cottam's alternative to my placing of Jn 8<sup>12-20</sup> suggested in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, October 1936, p. 45, the following points should be noted:

(i) He states that my remarks on 8<sup>12-20</sup> fit his

scheme of putting it after 9 just as well as my own of locating it after 9, 10<sup>19-21</sup>. But the οὖν in 8<sup>12</sup>, if original, requires that others than Jesus should be last speaking. Some such intervening conversation as that contained in 10<sup>19-21</sup> seems to be necessary before 8<sup>12-20</sup>.

(ii) 9<sup>35-41</sup> with its accusation of open-eyed, sinful refusal to believe—'They are guilty of "sin against the Holy Ghost" which for ever "remains" unforgivable'; cf. 8<sup>21</sup>, 20<sup>23</sup>' (Macgregor)—does account for 10<sup>19-21</sup> as well as, if not better than, 8<sup>12-20</sup>, the concluding words of which appear to indicate the end of this particular dispute and to make against the idea of an immediate resumption in 10<sup>19-21</sup>.

(iii) 8<sup>20</sup> with its διδάσκων, the tense of which implies continuance of the action, suggests that the teaching was carried on for at least some little time. 7<sup>25.26</sup> can therefore follow 8<sup>12-20</sup> in spite of the fact that the Pharisees say something to Jesus in 8<sup>13</sup>.

C. CLARE OKE.

*Sundridge, Ontario.*

## Entre Nous.

Frank Lenwood.

There is something which stirs the imagination in the life and death of Frank Lenwood. His biographer, Mr. Roger C. Wilson, says: 'His was a living essay in Christian Adventure.' The Memoir is published by the Student Christian Movement, with whose work Lenwood was so long identified (3s. 6d. net). We may say at once that this is a good biography—Lenwood has come alive with all his fine qualities, but with his weaknesses too—his limited sense of humour, for example.

When he was just a month short of sixty, Lenwood met his death in Switzerland when climbing the Aiguille D'Argentières. He had always been a keen mountaineer, loving the sport and the physical danger. But the mountains meant more to him than that. They brought to him a curious exaltation and feeling of nearness to God. 'It's wonderfully impressive to be in the midst of those great snows—it all speaks to you in a curious soaking irresistible way of the greatness and the purity of God . . . and as if there one knew that some day human society would reflect God's clearness and holiness as those snows do to-day.'

For there, on the white mysterious mountains,  
God's presence walks, and His Spirit is known,  
With a keen and piercing assurance, in wonder  
and awe and a trembling joy,  
That are strangers to him who only may walk in  
the valleys,  
In the warm, safe, bountiful valley.

Lenwood's heritage was a fine one. Son of a Congregational minister, he early showed intellectual ability. In the Oxford Locals he came out top of all England; won a scholarship to Rugby; in 1893 he got an open classical scholarship to Corpus Christi College, and when at Oxford he gained two firsts. And, although he remained within his own Congregational circle, attended Mansfield College, taught in a Mission Sunday School, held views on militarism, on teetotalism, on gambling that were the reverse of popular, he was elected President of the Union. 'He was one of the few speakers who could really turn votes, and he more than held his own in debate with Hilaire Belloc, John Simon, and F. E. Smith. Perhaps one of the hardest things that he did at Oxford was to speak at open-air evangelical services.



After training for the Congregational ministry at Mansfield College, he was offered a Tutorship in N.T. Greek, and stayed on for some years in Oxford. During these years his association with the S.C.M. began. He was Chairman of the Easter 1919 Conference at Matlock, where the other speakers were William Temple, T. Tatlow, Malcolm Spencer, Kenneth Maclellan, and H. G. Wood. In summing up the message of the Conference he said: 'We are involved in the Church's action and inaction. . . . We have agreed with the opinion of the marketplace that in practice the teachings of our Master are too lofty for application. We have refused to accept His standards of value, and we have redefined in our practice the content of the word "disciple," till discipleship has become insipid and commonplace. In the spirit of our workaday lives we have all of us denied Christ's lordship. In a word, *we are the Social Problem.*'

Foreign Missions were always near Lenwood's heart. He spent several years under the L.M.S. at Benares. Following a bad attack of typhoid he had to leave India, and was then appointed Foreign Secretary of the L.M.S. He was not always easy to work with, Mr. Wilson says. 'Perhaps a certain priggishness still remained from the early years. Routine never came very easily to him and he admonishes himself to keep Christian in the midst of office routine.' But no one working with him could fail to see the high ideals that lay behind all his mission work, and to feel that his great interest through it all was *people*. He 'desired to see them doing the will of God.'

In his later life Lenwood came to hold unorthodox views on the Person of Christ. He stated his position in *Jesus—Lord or Leader?* Feeling that his views might be harmful to the L.M.S. he resigned from the Secretaryship. Provided the Church and its teachers kept before themselves an unwearying determination to bring men to God, Lenwood did not believe that there was anything of religious value which would be destroyed by a belief that Jesus was human. In *Jesus—Lord or Leader?* he wrote: 'Instead of a doctrine of Incarnation raising problems to perplex the inquiring mind, we have, on the one hand, a human figure who trod the path we tread and helped His fellows to see what God was like—there is something wonderful to preach in that—and on the other hand, God the Father, more perfect and more tender to His children than even Jesus could be.'

Finding men of like views in the little Congregational Church at Plaistow—Greengate—he became their minister and put in eight years of self-

sacrificing work, showing a growing discipleship and an ever more burning zeal. 'The Incarnate Lord became the Beloved Leader, but his religion remained the same.'

Lenwood's life was full of good fellowship—he and Mrs. Lenwood kept open house—'the finest example of Christian living that many of their friends had known.' 'I've had the life of a millionaire,' he said to a friend. His life was joyous, and his death was joyous. Godfrey Phillips who went to Argentières to be at his funeral wrote: 'Those of us who know the Lenwoods would all expect that Mrs. Lenwood would show immense courage and that there would be no mourning or depression. But I have never seen death so put in its place as I saw it at Argentières.'

#### Emmanuel.

Mr. R. A. Bosshardt of the China Inland Mission has now written an account of his own and Mr. Hayman's time of captivity. The title is *The Restraining Hand*. The volume has been published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton. It contains almost three hundred pages and is attractively bound, and the price is only 2s. 6d. net.

It will be remembered that Mr. Bosshardt and Mr. Hayman were captured in October 1934 by the Red Armies in Kweichow. They endured great privations, and all the early efforts to negotiate for their release were unsuccessful. In November of the next year the Communists agreed to a much smaller ransom than they had at first demanded, and Mr. Hermann Becker succeeded in getting the money handed over. Then he heard that the Communists had broken their promise, one missionary only had been released and one detained. Mr. Becker writes the last chapter of the book and this is what he says: 'On the 20th, I left after breakfast on muleback to meet the missionary, not knowing which one I would see. About four miles out I saw Mr. Hayman coming and the empty chair. It was very hard for me to see him alone, and he himself could not restrain his tears. His first words to me were: "Bosshardt is a saint."'

Mr. Hayman had been over a year in captivity. Another six months were to pass before Mr. Bosshardt was released. Mr. Hayman tells how they spent Christmas, 1934. 'It was also during this period of rigorous confinement that Christmas morning dawned. Judging from outward circumstances there could not have been a more dismal day. The weather was cold, there was no fire and our sole pastime was—sitting on the floor. The only



thing to relieve the monotony was our three meals of rice and vegetable which were brought to us and which were eaten in silence. Truly, as seen by the outward eye, the day was dreary, gloomy and cheerless. But our Lord sent a message to me in one word which made a world of difference—"Emmanuel—God with us." I longed to pass it on to Mr. Hayman. The idea came to form the letters with pieces of straw. And so, unbeknownst to the guard, it became a message of cheer to my companion also. The whole scene was changed into one of joy. "If God be for us who can be against us?" And so, knowing we should be imprisoned no longer than He would allow, we rejoiced in tribulation.

#### Disappointment.

The Methodist Publishing House have an excellent small monthly magazine for lay preachers and class leaders—*The Preachers' and Class-Leaders' Magazine* (4d.). The Rev. W. J. Tunbridge is contributing every month a study in biography, and in the November number he writes in an interesting way on 'The Christian as a Barrister—Marshall Hall.' This is a shortened account of his study.

'From time to time I have heard him in the courts, and he impressed me with his humanity and masterliness. It was an education in advocacy to sit at his feet. . . . There my knowledge ceased, but the story of his life, as told by Marjoribanks, has made me feel that I have met one who was not only more brilliant but more courageous and kindly than most of us. Behind the barrister was the man, whose life was a tragedy, whose body was rarely without pain and whose disappointments were unending. . . .

'He married early in life, was much in love, but soon after the marriage his wife left him. He endured in silence many unjust and cruel criticisms, and whenever he spoke of his wife to some one who had known her it was always with pity and tenderness. . . . How truly Marjoribanks writes: "It is hard to see reason or justice in such a catastrophe as befell Marshall Hall at the very threshold of his career; yet it can at any rate be said that it is doubtful whether, without this heart-rending experience, he could have had that vivid power of compassion which made other men's tragedies his own." . . .

'The second catastrophe in his life was one for which he must be held partly responsible. He had a case against the Harmsworth Press, and although he won in the lower court, the victory was purchased at a high price. All the money and influence

of the Harmsworth circle was now against him, and an unwise attack on the judge made other judges his enemies. When the case was heard in the Court of Appeal, Hall was dealt with very severely—some say unjustly—and his practice, which had had a remarkable growth, suffered very considerably, so that his income nearly vanished. He had hardly recovered from this when he lost his seat at Southport, which closed his chance of preferment by reason of Parliamentary services to his party, so in mid-life it looked as if life was a failure. . . . His courage was a wonderful thing. He faced the future with cheerful confidence and steadily recovered much that was lost, till he became one of our most noted advocates. . . . "He was one of those rare men who have the courage to fight their own secret conviction that they are failures and prove it to be utterly false." . . .

'How few knew that the man whose physical appearance was so attractive, was handicapped with sickness. . . .

'The honour of judgeship comes to men who prove themselves great as barristers; Hall expected such reward. Again and again he hoped, but when appointments were made he was passed by. Some who had been his juniors and who were less gifted than himself received promotion, but for some reason such recognition was not for him. He felt it very keenly. . . .

'It would be easy to criticize the way in which he sought in Spiritualism some strong proof of the life beyond, and one could dwell upon the conscious and unconscious influence of his saintly mother. Was it without meaning that they found amongst his papers an early letter from her in which she quotes the hymn, "O Jesus, I have promised"? We can close with the thought that is given in a letter of a friend sent to Hall on his last Christmas Eve. "You've grasped some of the things that aren't worth having, and missed others; but, of the things you can't buy, you've got your full share."

#### 'Courage.'

Sir Harry Preston, in *Leaves from my Unwritten Diary*, tells a story of Barrie.

'We all went back in a cab afterwards to Sir James's apartment overlooking the river on Adelphi Terrace. It is a beautiful home that Barrie has. He took us from room to room, switching the electric light on as we entered and off as we passed out. There was one room like a ship's cabin, from the windows of which we looked out on the nocturnal river. We wound up a very happy evening, I



remember, playing billiards, and talking mightily of men and things.

'On a side table in the river-view room stood a casket. In the casket reposed the manuscript of the last diary that Captain Scott, the Arctic explorer, wrote. He wrote it in his tent as he lay in his sleeping-bag beyond human succour facing death from cold and starvation. "Courage," he traced with his dying hand. It was the last word he ever wrote, and the letters drop away as his hand fell, so that that final word straggles down the page. In due course the diary came back to England, and so to Sir James Barrie, Scott's friend, and the godfather of his son.

'Now, Barrie's right hand had become disabled. He could not write with it. And he could not, like Conrad, when his rheumatic hands failed him, dictate. He was about to give up. Never again would that magic right hand pen the enchanted words which have moved millions of human hearts to tears and laughter.

'But at that crisis in his life Barrie took Scott's diary out of the casket. He saw that last struggling, drooping word written by a dying man years ago in a terrible desert of ice around the Pole . . . "Courage . . ."

'And he said to himself: "If Scott had the courage to go on writing his imperishable message as he lay dying there, I ought to have the fortitude to teach myself to write with my left hand."

'And with infinite labour and patience he did teach himself to write with his left hand.

'He regained the use of his right hand later, but he still keeps his left in practice. "I will not discard my good friend, who stood by me so well in adversity," he said.'

#### Edwardian Poetry.

Messrs. Richards have just begun a series of selections from Edwardian poetry. Each volume (paper covers) costs one shilling. And the first poets chosen are Anna Wickham, M. P. Shiel, and E. H. Visiak. We confess we have some difficulty with Mr. Shiel. From Mr. Visiak's poems we quote 'The Sower,' and from Anna Wickham 'The Happy Mathematician.'

#### THE SOWER.

Rest, weary heart. Your work is done.  
The sown seed ripens in the sun.  
The toil you gave, the care, the pain,  
Have won to light the imprisoned grain;  
And many labourers are come  
Unto the festal harvest home.

But will the singing reapers know  
The price you paid, the debt they owe?  
And will they give you thanks and praise  
To cheer your solitary days?

They shall not need. It matters not.  
For, in the harvest fields of love,  
Wherein the holy reapers move,  
Your fame shall never be forgot.  
Your soul hath won through bar and clod  
Unto the dazzling fields of God.

#### THE HAPPY MATHEMATICIAN.

When he was nine, he thought he knew  
All about two times two.  
He sang his tables out aloud,  
And he was very glad and proud.  
He thought: 'I'll not be weak or poor,  
Because twice two are always four;  
I know this now, and I'll get knowledge  
Even more fine, when I'm at college.'

When he was ninety-nine or more,  
Wise Death came knocking at his door.  
Death said: 'As you get nearer Heaven,  
Twice two are five or six or seven;  
And at the centre of God's heart,  
The whole is as the smallest part.'  
The old man laughed: 'That interests me.  
Teach me your tables, Death,' said he.

#### Religion in Soviet Russia

The Russian Church Aid Fund is hampered by an impression that some change in the Soviet policy towards religion has made its work no longer necessary. The President is anxious to have this impression corrected. The number of churches allowed to remain open is diminishing month by month. Help is much required to preserve the centre in Paris for the study of Russian Orthodox Theology (President, Russian Church Aid Fund, 2-3 Duke Street, London, S.W.1).

#### Erratum.

The word 'sixth' on p. 102, column 1, line 24, of Professor Moffatt's article on *The Ninth Commandment* in the December number should, of course, have been 'eighth.' A proof reader apologizes.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,  
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,  
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.